



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/princetonseminar5911prin>

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

When Truth Is a Belt

John A. Mackay

The Christian Imperative

James I. McCord

Sermons:

The God Beyond Theology

Bryant M. Kirkland

A New Commandment

Harold N. Englund

Toward the Christian Captivation
of the Suburbs

Seward Hiltner

Issues in Church Education Today

D. Campbell Wyckoff

VOLUME LIX, NUMBER 1

NOVEMBER 1965

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

James I. McCord
President

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Peter K. Emmons, President	John M. Templeton, Vice-President
Frederick E. Christian, Secretary	William E. Lawder, Treasurer
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, New York, N.Y., Assistant Treasurer	
James I. Armstrong	John W. Meister
Clem E. Bininger	W. Beverly Murphy
Eugene Carson Blake	Luther I. Reogle
Ulysses B. Blakeley	William H. Scheide
Allan M. Frew	H. D. Moore Sherrerd
John T. Galloway	Laird H. Simons, Jr.
Ralph Cooper Hutchison	W. Sherman Skinner
Miss Eleanor P. Kelly	James E. Spivey
Bryant M. Kirkland	George E. Sweazey
Harry G. Kuch	Mrs. Olive W. Switz
Robert J. Lamont	James M. Tunnell, Jr.
Raymond I. Lindquist	Samuel G. Warr
John S. Linen	David B. Watermulder
J. Keith Louden	Irving A. West
Henry Luce, III	George S. Young
Thomas M. MacMillan	

TRUSTEES EMERITI

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

DONALD MACLEOD, Editor

EDWARD J. JURII, *Book Review Editor*

The BULLETIN is published quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey. Numbers 1, 2, and 3 of each volume are mailed free of charge to all alumni and on an exchange basis with various institutions. Number 4 in the series is the annual academic catalogue of the Seminary and may be obtained by request to the Office of the Registrar.

Second class postage paid at Princeton, N.J. 08540

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. LIX

NOVEMBER, 1965

Number 1

Donald Macleod, Editor

Edward J. Jurji, Book Review Editor

Book Reviews:

History

Ecumenics: The Science of the Church Universal, by John A. Mackay	Lesslie Newbigin	60
The Early Christian Church, by J. G. Davies	Norman V. Hope	62
The Deacon Wore Spats, by John T. Stewart		62
Changeful Page, Autobiography of William Wand		63
The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, 1500-1600		64
Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion, by Richard R. Niebuhr		65
The Christian Centuries: A New History of the Catholic Church, Vol. I, by J. Daniélou & H. I. Marrou	Edward J. Jurji	
Men Who Shaped the Western Church, by H. von Campenhausen	James H. Nichols	66

Biblical

All the Kingdoms of the Earth, by N. K. Gottwald	Charles T. Fritsch	67
The Anchor Bible: Proverbs; Ecclesiastes, by R. B. Y. Scott		67
Shechem, by G. Ernest Wright	Philip C. Hammond	68
Studia Evangelica, Vols. II & III, by F. L. Cross	Bruce M. Metzger	70

Theology

The Demands of Freedom, by Helmut Gollwitzer Charles C. West 71

Practical Theology

The True Wilderness, by Harry A. Williams	Donald Macleod	72
Selected Prayers, by Karl Barth		72
The Comfortable Pew, by Pierre Berton		73
Just Think, Mr. Berton, by Ted Byfield		73
Christian Conscience and Negro Emancipation, by R. Moellering	James E. Loder	74
Understanding and Helping the Narcotic Addict, by T. L. Duncan, James N. Lapsley		76
Helping Youth in Conflict, by Francis I. Frellick		76

STUDENTS' LECTURESHIP ON MISSIONS

November 8-9, 1965

CHARLES W. FORMAN

Professor of Missions

Yale University Divinity School

ANNIE KINKEAD WARFIELD LECTURESHIP

February 7-11, 1966

OTTO WEBER

Professor of Reformed Theology

University of Göttingen

“Calvin’s Doctrine of the Word”

L. P. STONE LECTURESHIP

April 11-14, 1966

ERIK ROUTLEY

Augustine-Bristo Congregational Church

Edinburgh, Scotland

“Church Music and Hymnody”

IN THIS ISSUE

WHEN President Emeritus, John A. Mackay, returned to Princeton for the Fiftieth Re-Union of his class, he delivered the address, "When Truth Is a Belt," at the Seminary's 153rd Commencement on June 7, 1965. A review of Dr. Mackay's latest book, *Ecumenics: The Science of the Church Universal*, appearing also in this issue, is by the Rt. Rev. Lesslie Newbigin, Bishop of the Church of South India at Madras.

The farewell message of the President of the Seminary, James I. McCord, to the members of the 1965 Graduating Class, is entitled, "The Christian Imperative."

Two sermons are included: the Baccalaureate Sermon entitled "The God Beyond Theology," given on June 6 by the Reverend Bryant M. Kirkland, D.D., minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York; and "A New Commandment," delivered in Miller Chapel on April 7 by the Reverend Harold N. Englund, D.D., minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, California.

A paper, "Toward the Christian Captivation of the Suburbs," by Professor Seward Hiltner, Ph.D., was presented at a conference, Consultation on the Suburban Church, held on the campus on April 30 under the auspices of the Department of Field Service.

Professor D. Campbell Wyckoff, Ph.D. of the Department of Christian Education, presented the paper "Issues in Church Education Today," at the Consultation on Church and Public School Relations, Division of Christian Education, United Church Board of Homeland Ministries, April 23-26, at the Denbigh Conference Center, Radnor, Pennsylvania.

Memorial Minutes are published in recognition of the passing of two distinguished members of the Seminary's Board of Trustees. The tribute to the late Reverend Albert J. McCartney, D.D. was written by the Reverend Ralph Cooper Hutchison, Ph.D., President Emeritus of Lafayette College and a fellow member of the Board of Trustees. The Reverend Frederick E. Christian, D.D., minister of the Presbyterian Church, Westfield, New Jersey, eulogizes the late Reverend Benjamin F. Farber, D.D., who was his predecessor as Secretary to the Board of Trustees for fourteen years. Your editor is indebted to the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., minister of the National Presbyterian Church, for permitting us to publish his personal testimonial to Dr. McCartney, delivered at the Memorial Service in Washington, D.C. on August 24, 1965.

—Donald Macleod

WHEN TRUTH IS A BELT

JOHN A. MACKAY

DR. EMMONS, President McCord, members of the Board of Trustees, members of the Faculty and of the Graduating Class, fellow alumni, dear friends:

I am not being conventional or merely courteous when I say that the privilege of addressing you at this time is an honor that I deeply cherish. It is not unnatural, but only human, that I should stand before you as one profoundly moved. As I think of the occasion, and scan the faces before me and around me, including that of an old teacher,¹ it could not well be otherwise.

Present in this audience are a number of my classmates, and not least, the distinguished member of our class who presides over this gathering. They and I graduated together from Princeton Theological Seminary just fifty years ago. When we first met on the beloved campus the sun of the Victorian era, with its watchwords, "evolution" and "progress," was moving towards its setting. The day we received our diplomas and bade each other farewell, the guns of the First World War were booming.

On this Graduation Day, as you who are members of the Class of 1965 come forward to receive the academic awards of your labors, and brace yourselves for tomorrow, you cannot be unaware that it will be your lot to live with revolution both as word and as reality. Human history confronts a revolu-

tionary springtime. But I would ask you to greet this springtime with calm resolution; for it is God's springtime, albeit His terrible springtime.

Never so much as in this revolutionary era could words mean more for men and women graduating from a theological seminary than the words that inspired the revolutionary zeal of first century Christians. Those words are enshrined in the Church's first creedal statement, "Jesus Christ is Lord." This timeless truth regarding the centrality of Christ and His Lordship in history, must illumine the thought and determine the action of the worldwide community of Christ, through all the changing patterns and the complex issues of this terrestrial life.

In the shadow of change and the changeless, let me share with you some thoughts regarding things that have been and continue to be, very real to me. I will begin with reminiscences of yesterday, and, then proceed to a confrontation of today. There will be involved the basic question of truth in both its subjective and its objective dimension.

I

A controversy is growing in Church circles as to the significance and status of God, of religious experience, of subjectivity in general, of conversion in particular. The controversy is closely related to the meaning and marks of Christian discipleship. It involves

¹ Dr. Frederick W. Loetscher.

Church members, Christian ministers, and the Christian Church as a whole. This particular issue, I venture to affirm, is the most crucial that confronts contemporary Christianity. Will you forgive me if, in seeking to make a contribution to the current discussion, I become reminiscent and lyrical. Let me for a few brief minutes move backward into yesterday.

I once penned these words: *The road to Tomorrow leads through Yesterday*. At one of the crossroads of my life, my family and I were on a western journey, headed towards the Yellowstone Park. We spent a weekend among the Black Hills of South Dakota. It was there, as I gazed at those historic figures that are sculptured side by side on towering crags, that the relationship between Yesterday and Tomorrow took on a new dimension in my thinking.

This question is an abiding question, and was never more real than in our time. Whether people are in an evolutionary or a revolutionary mood, whether they be Christians or non-Christians, Leftists or Rightists, whether they live in the Americas or in Europe, in Asia, Africa, Latin America or the Islands of the Pacific, they cannot evade the question, What has Yesterday to say to Today, what guidance does it offer to Tomorrow?

Speaking for myself, Yesterday is primarily significant in my life because it is linked to an early revolutionary experience of the reality of God.

In these days when the question of Deity is up afresh for discussion in Church and society, I would not be "honest to God" or to myself, to the Bishop of Woolwich, to Paul Tillich

or to you, if I did not avow, soberly and unashamedly, that a sense of a living Divine Presence, of a Hand, strong, amorous and controlling, has been the most decisive factor in my thinking and living from teenage years to beyond the threescore and ten. A proud Celtic youth was yesterday gripped by a Presence that changed the direction of his life.

Why do I speak like this? Why should I risk being called a sentimental, a romanticist, a candidate for psychiatric treatment or, perchance, a pathetic instance of senility? I have taken this risk because, from my early teens, Deity has not been for me a God up yonder, out there, or in there. He has been a God right here. The metaphysical "Ground of Being" became a spiritual Presence beside me, a Hand that held both my present and my future life. I learned that life, if I trusted him, could be adventurous; and adventurous it became.

Memory, on its road to Yesterday, takes me back to old Miller Chapel in the spring of 1915. It was my turn to preach the customary class sermon, in the presence of classmates and under the scrutiny of our teacher of homiletics. My text was a line from one of the psalms, "My times are in Thy hand" (Ps. 31:15).

These words were expressive of a mood of quiet confidence and deep conviction that my life, as I faced the uncharted future, was in the hand of God and that he would direct my way.

I cannot recall a single word of what I said on that occasion. But what I felt was something that went beyond a sense of God as the mere Ground of one's being and of all Being, more

than a conviction that all human life is lived under the general direction of Deity. There was the intimate conviction of being in a Hand that held me lovingly and would control my life.

Specially meaningful for me was the Hebrew poet's use of *Thy*, "in *Thy* hand," following the words he addressed to Deity in the preceding line "Thou art *my* God." He was *mine*, I was *his*. There was the sense of a personal Presence who had taken me under his Sovereign care.

On another occasion, during the same period in my seminary course, it became my turn to spend a weekend in New York, where we students were supposed to go in small groups to visit different types of mission work and to hear great preachers. Dr. J. H. Jowett was then minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church. On that Sunday he opened the afternoon service with the hymn, "Come, Thou Fount of Every Blessing." Being a young Scot, brought up in a religious tradition where only metrical psalms were allowed in worship, it happened to be the first time I had ever heard this now favorite hymn. Two lines in particular expressed my life's deepest yearning:

"Let Thy grace, Lord, like a fetter
Bind my wandering heart to Thee."

II

As I share with you this reminiscence, I seem to overhear a query: "But tell us, what exactly do you mean by God, and by the Hand of God, in this context?"

Now I am fully aware that to be meaningful today, even when you address a Christian audience, you can

take nothing for granted where the name of God is concerned. You will not take it amiss, therefore, if I become still further reminiscent in order to clarify my position. For I too, if I may use words that have recently become familiar, I too must be "honest to God." It is necessary, in the words of another contemporary thinker that I should "validate the idea of transcendence for the modern mind." In so doing I must also, of course, be honest with myself. So on this road called *Honesty*, I retrace my steps still further into Yesterday. From a seminary chapel and a metropolitan church, I go back to a Scottish hillside, to a time when your speaker was in his teens.

I was a young teenager when God first became real to me, when Jesus Christ became dear to me, when religion became more than conventional ideas and practices in my boyhood life. Of a sudden, it became a very exciting thing for me to be alive, and a very meaningful thing to desire to be admitted to church membership, upon confession of faith in Christ.

The apostolic word, "and you he made alive when you were dead," (Eph. 2:1) became validated in my existence. The experience, which was outwardly undramatic but inwardly decisive, followed a period of boyhood longing for something I wanted to be and was not. My anxiety and longing I would vocally utter each night before falling asleep, echoing the words of that anguished woman who addressed a plea to Jesus Christ: "Lord help me." Something happened, the details of which I will not enter into; but literally everything became new. A sense of new life, and of the personal presence of Christ in life, was followed

by a compulsive call to be a minister, and, later, to be a missionary.

As I look back to those days, in no sentimental or romantic mood, I vividly recall what an exciting thing it became for me to be a Christian. The Bible, which had been conventional reading from childhood now became a literary must, especially the Psalms and the New Testament. Most exciting of all were the letters of that man born in Tarsus, and reborn on the Damascus highway. Dumas' *Count of Monte Cristo*, which I had received as a school prize, had now to take second place. This teenager would rest his fishing rod on the bank of a stream, and sprawl for a while on the grass, with the New Testament open before him. He had found something which was far more exciting than either fiction or fishing. God was someone he could talk to in a very natural way, a *Thou* who had become meaningful to the boyish *I*. This *Thou* was a "*Wholly Other*," He was transcendent, yet he was real and dear, and relevant, to all the concerns of my boyish life.

The new dimension which life had suddenly taken on gave me a special interest in learning from older Christians what their experience had been. I coveted to know all they could tell me about what had happened in their own life history and what God had come to mean to them in daily living.

I developed at the same time a passion for literature and theology and some years later for philosophy. John Bunyan and John Milton, Shakespeare and Wordsworth, Lord Macaulay and Thomas Carlyle, Thomas Chalmers and Jonathan Edwards became favorite authors.

Coincident with this passion for

literature was a passion for a person, Jesus Christ. I could say with Raymond Lull, that famous Spanish scholar and missionary to Moslems in Medieval times, "I have one passion in life and it is he." At a very early date in my life, heart and mind, love, passion and theological thought, became inspired by Paul's cosmic vision that all things would eventually be united in Him, Jesus Christ, the Saviour of men's lives and the Lord of history.

III

It is an inescapable fact that a person's philosophy of life, his theology, and also his interpretation of the Christian Church and its role in history, comes from something not derived from reason, or from any purely empirical or rational study. Well and truly did that great philosopher, scientist and mystic Saint, Blaise Pascal, remark, "the heart too has its reasons which reason does not know." Your speaker's life and thought have been determined, have become shaped and inspired, by something positive and creative that happened in his heart and to his heart, something which aroused an intellectual passion and shaped the course of his thinking and his living.

In college years I owed an unspeakable debt to my philosophy professor, J. B. Baille, a leading Hegelian and a translator of Hegel's works. He opened up for me the dimension of philosophical thought and provided a perspective for an intellectual approach to religion, for which he himself frequently expressed disdain. Very moving and unforgettable was his statement one day in the classroom—that in the whole range of literature no book descended

in such an extraordinary manner upon the intimacy between God and individual persons as did the Book of Psalms. God had little personal reality in his own life, but he wanted to be "honest to God" where others were concerned. The student did not agree with many of his teacher's ideas; but he admired him and owed him an unspeakable debt, not least the challenge of a philosophical position he could not personally adopt.

The sense of a Hand, and of one's life being securely in it, continued to grow in my consciousness. The conviction developed, slowly but steadily, that God wanted me to be a missionary, and that my mission field should be some South American land. It was following the decision to give myself to missionary service abroad, and the pledging of troth to one destined to become my life companion, and who is here present as my most critical listener, that the sense of divine guidance, of being in God's hand, took on a new dimension.

There began to appear at crucial crossroads on one's journey what I would call *undesigned coincidences*. By "undesigned coincidences" I mean *happenings that occur which one had neither intended nor could have anticipated, but which, when they take place, enable a person to fulfill a commitment he undertook in obedience to what he considered to be God's Will*.

I learned by experience, especially during graduate study in Spain, that if I made the service of Christ and the Gospel the goal of my life, and strove to equip myself in the fullest possible manner for that service, facing each new situation as it arose, God would not let me down. And he did not. As

to making the road map, I left that to God. And he made it, routing the path through unexpected places in three continents—until this hour.

IV

With this let me say good-bye to lyrical musing, and to subjective and personal experience as a prime essential for the knowledge of God. Let me skip over the five decades of life from student days in the beloved community of Princeton to this new Commencement Day. Allow me from this point onward to look at the question of truth in its *objective* dimension, and in relation to the human situation as we face it today. Piety, or whatever term be used to designate a personal relationship to Deity, need not, should not, separate one from concern for humanity in every phase of man's existence.

Literally never has the question, "What is Truth?" been more crucial than in this revolutionary time, when the foundations of thought and life are being shaken as rarely before in the history of mankind.

Truth in general was once defined by that Anglican saint and scholar, William Temple, as the "perfect correlation of mind and reality." Christian truth as God's self-disclosure in Holy Scripture and in Jesus Christ, is all that and much more. Christian truth is worthily apprehended, and fulfills its function in life and in thought, when it is not merely a luminous possession of the mind, or an experience of the heart but when it is accepted as a belt that girds life for action in the service of God and man.

Of timeless significance in this connection are St. Paul's words in the

Ephesian Letter: "Buckle on the belt of Truth" (Eph. 6:14 N.E.B.). The "belt" is the symbol of the fact that Christian truth is dynamic in quality. It is inseparably related to action, to action in which the whole personality is involved. We cannot really have truth unless truth also has us.

Christian truth, let us be quite clear, must be given a theological dimension. If Christians are to be intelligently belted in the great classical tradition of the Christian faith, and not live in an intellectual vacuum; if they are to be more than mere fanatics, gripped by some slogan or cliché—it is essential that they cultivate a theological understanding of what Christianity is and of what it means to be a Christian.

Let us, therefore, thank God for the great creeds and confessional statements of the Christian Church. We Christians must have Truth just as Truth must have us. We must have, as far as possible, a structured understanding of what it is the Church believes, and what we ourselves believe, and why. We should on this account rejoice whenever an effort is made by the Church to reformulate its faith more adequately, to express it more clearly, and to give it the fullest possible relevancy to the cultural and ethical problems by which Christians are confronted, in the particular epoch in which their witness is given.

While this is true, let Christians beware, let Christian ministers especially beware, of mere theological sophistication. I have said elsewhere that theological sophistication without spiritual commitment leads to pompous sterility.

There is a scholastic trend in cultural

and religious circles today to treat truths as birds to be pursued and caught and then caged for study or exhibit. There are theological pundits who are master ornithologists. They love to put on display the winged creatures that belong to the great family of Truth. But a theological aviary in which truths, whether as facts, ideas, or systems are exhibited merely for admiration or study cannot represent ultimate truth for thoughtful men and women who want to commit their lives to what they believe with their minds.

It is legitimate and sometimes essential, in human relations, that Truth should be a *badge* to be worn. It is important that Christians be willing to be identified by some visible symbol to show who they are, for what they stand, and, perchance the particular church fellowship denomination to which they belong. But let Christians eschew the *Cult of the Badge*. Let them not substitute an identification card or label for a personal understanding of the Truth, and for a dynamic commitment to the Truth of which the badge is merely a symbol.

One of the perils of Church membership today is precisely this *Cult of the Badge*. Willingness to be publicly regarded as belonging to a local congregation or to a world confessional body, is not enough. T. S. Eliot's warning of the "hollow men, with headpiece filled with straw" continues to have relevancy.

A Spanish peasant, proud to identify himself as belonging to the "one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church," was once asked this question, "Tell me, my friend, what is it you believe?" He replied: "Sir, I believe what the Church believes." "And what does the Church

believe?" "The Church believes what I believe."

Nominal Catholicism has become a great concern in Roman Catholic circles, especially in Latin America. An eminent Jesuit theologian, with whom I was privileged, while in Santiago, Chile, last summer, to engage in public dialogue on the Ecumenical Movement, made this remark, "We Catholics must make Christians." Deeply moved by his words, I responded, "We Protestants must also make Christians." And I went on to say, "Speaking as a loyal Presbyterian, we Presbyterians too must make Christians."

It must be recognized that in large segments of the Christian Church today there is no more than a very nominal Christianity, a vacuous, institutional nominalism. We are forced to admit that in very many Christian congregations, Church members have become Church alumni; they appear in the sanctuary solely on the great anniversary occasions.

V

There is a mood which, until recently, was all pervasive in academic centers. Intellectual maturity was identified with what might be called the *Cult of the Uncommitted*. The real intellectual was regarded as one who possessed a vast panoramic view of all Truth, but who felt himself to be so superior that he would not identify himself with any one truth in particular. He became an addict to what the Spanish philosopher, Unamuno, called "intellectual Don Juanism," which being translated into English, means, "intellectual libertinism." It was to such people that Unamuno

said again and again: "Get a great idea, marry it, found a home with it, and raise a family."

But "intellectual Don Juanism" and what I once called "the balcony view of life" are having their troubles. I have been thrilled by the way in which university professors and students, together with journalists, essayists, poets and artists, have recently taken a determined public stand on matters of international policy where moral principles, and the realities of human relationship, are involved. As regards Christian Churchmen, I thank God for the recent marches to Selma and Montgomery and for the new concern over international policy, racial equality, social justice, and human welfare in general. May this be an indication, in both the secular and the religious order, that the Cult of the Uncommitted is being replaced by another.

Let the fact be faced: If the importance of truth, and its relevance to life, is to be taken seriously, there must be personal commitment to great ideas. *Commitment* is of the very essence of life and thought. A person begins to be alive and truly human when he commits himself to something greater than himself. That something may be an idea, a cause, or a person. To be a Christian in the deepest sense is to be committed to Christ. That means to be Christ's man, Christ's woman, a "saint" in the original New Testament sense, one for whom Jesus Christ is the Truth, the luminous liberating Truth, to whom the liberated self gives ultimate loyalty in love and obedience. "You are my friends," said Christ, "if you do what I command you." Jesus Christ calls for committed people. He is not interested

in mere ecclesiastical "buddies," in proud orthodox dogmatists, in liturgical aesthetes, or in Christian pharisees who are willing to bear his name for status and gain, but who never serve his cause. In the Christianity of our time there needs to be a rediscovery, both of the timeless and the contemporary significance of Christian commitment, Christian obedience and Christian discipline, both as regards individual persons and the Church as a corporate body.

If an official statement of the Church's faith, for example, is to be continuous with the Eternal and relevant to the Temporal, it is not enough that it affirm the glorious truth that God, through Christ's life, death and resurrection, has made provision for the reconciliation of man to himself and of men to one another. Reconciliation, if it is to fulfill what God designed should happen through the work of Christ, is a two-sided phenomenon. The reconciliation of God and man can become a reality only when man is willing to become reconciled to God through faith in Christ and obedience to him. Reconciliation is not something that can be forced upon man. If this fact is not taken into account, talk about reconciliation can be a mere theological cliché, romantic sentimentalism, an escape from reality, a failure to recognize the real human issue. God has done his part; he calls upon men, he waits for men, to do their part, by responding to his abiding love for them.

Contemporary significance must, therefore, be given to the Biblical concept of repentance. Repentance involves a right about face on man's part, followed by his personal response to Di-

vine love, to God's measureless yearning to be loved, just as he himself has loved and continues to love. But when reconciliation does take place in the wake of man's response to God, it must not become an end in itself. It is for the sake of a dynamic Divine-human partnership in the fulfillment of God's grand design in Christ.

This same principle applies to the Ecumenical Movement, and to every laudable effort in the direction of Christian unity and Church union. The Church, in every phase and dimension of its reality, must never think of unity as an end in itself. It must think of unity rather as a means whereby, as the body of Christ, it becomes the instrument which Jesus Christ its Head uses to carry on his work in the world. In this way the Church becomes redemptively relevant to every phase of the human situation.

If the Christian Church today, in both its local and its ecumenical dimension, is to be true to its nature and fulfill its destiny, it must match and surpass those dynamic crusading forces in the secular order, whose objectives for the future of mankind run counter to God's purpose in Christ. In this revolutionary epoch the Church would do well to spend less time in academic talk *about* unity, and dedicate more time to crusading action *in* unity. In a word, the Christian Church must "Buckle on the belt of Truth."

For those of us who belong to the "historical churches" of Protestantism it is a thrilling thing to observe what is happening in the so-called "non-historical" communions, and also in the great Roman Catholic Church. Both to the right and to the left of the Protes-

tant highway exciting developments are taking place. These developments are expressive of great Christian verities that are being rediscovered and of concerns that are given expression in contemporary terms. The Spirit of God is at work, whether it be in Pentecostal glossolalia, and dynamic evangelism; or in the rediscovery of the Bible, the new emphasis upon the Lordship of Christ, the quest of the new life in Christ, the manifestation of an ecumenical spirit, the pursuit of relevancy to the human situation, that have begun to appear in the great Roman communion.

VI

Never was it a more exciting time to be alive and to be a Christian than it is today, even though the skies are lowering and ominous signs begin to fill the horizon. Evidence abounds that human civilization is steadily moving toward a time of judgment, a new "Day of the Lord." Let it never be forgotten that God, the loving Reconciler is also God the Judge. Let us be concerned about the question that Christ addressed to his contemporaries in Palestine, "How is it that you do not discern this time?"

I do not speak in a pessimistic mood, but in a realistic perspective. Following recent journeys in Asia and in Latin America, I have come to the conclusion that the Judge is at the door. The dimension of Judgment, let it not be forgotten, belongs to the essence of Biblical thought. Its sombre reality stands out in the writings of Israel's prophets, in the teaching of Jesus, and in the witness of the Apostles. Whenever and wherever man's way for himself, in per-

sons or in peoples, runs counter to God's way for man and for man's relations with his fellows, fateful consequences inevitably follow.

Christians and all citizens in this generation must confront the fact that certain ominous trends have emerged. These are: First, there is the glorification of absolute power; second, the pursuit of anarchic freedom, that is, freedom to acquire limitless wealth and to indulge unrestrained appetite; third, the beatification of lying. It is held in certain circles that if lying can give power the freedom it needs, Blessed be the liars! It is no exaggeration to say that in our country today, Truth is becoming a captive in the land of the free. We confront a situation in which a lie can be canonized, in which dedication to falsehood can make one a candidate for national sainthood.

In view of the millions upon millions of human beings, hungry, landless, living in misery, under the rod and scorn of wealthy oppressors, and brutal dictators, the vision of the "boiling pot," which the boy Jeremiah once saw on the Judean plateau, near his home in Anathoth, takes on contemporary significance. It was the burden of Jeremiah's message that, unless his people took God and righteousness seriously and were concerned about truth and justice, a pagan power from the north would be used by God for the doom of the Holy City.

Let us face the fact that this could happen today. A political power, ideologically godless, could be used by God to exercise judgment upon any nation which, while professing to live "under God," does not take God or his moral order seriously.

VII

At such a time the figure of Christ Crucified, who is the central reality of the Christian faith, takes on fresh meaning. The pointing finger of John the Baptist, standing near the cross, in that artistic masterpiece of the German painter, Grunewald, and the words he utters, "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29), acquire special significance. Christ Crucified must not be given exclusive significance as an historical fact, a theological idea, or a liturgical symbol. The cross must become engraven on the hearts of Christians. It must be no mere sacred emblem that dangles from their necks, or a symbol that greets them when they assemble for worship.

Christian men and women, and the Christian churches everywhere, must, through the power of Christ's resurrection, share like Paul the fellowship of his sufferings in every situation in which their lot is cast. The cross will thereby become a dynamic reality. Participation by Christians in the sufferings of Christ for the redemption of mankind, must mark Christian thought and life in this revolutionary time when Christianity and the civilization it created are undergoing their most crucial test.

In conclusion, and in the context of what I have said, let me address myself to those of you for whom today will be the beginning of a new life.

Dear friends of the Graduating Group: *Buckle on the belt of Truth.* Brace yourselves for the road ahead.

Be realists, Christian realists, responsive to the reality of God, sensitive to

the reality of men, whatever their race, or class, the structure of their society, or the ideology of their beliefs.

With intellectual conviction, attested by personal experience, may you live by the faith that Christianity is Christ.

Make the Bible your closest companion in the realm of letters, the chief medium of your communion with God and of your knowledge of God. Remember that in its deepest essence the Bible is a book about Christ. Let the Book of Books continue to open up to you the splendor of God's purpose in his Son. May it be the chief medium whereby you help others to come to know Christ and to serve him in the fellowship of the One Holy Catholic Church, which is his Body.

Make it your mission to give present day reality to the Gospel of Christ in the life and thought of the world. Committed to the truth that the Church's primary task is evangelical and missionary, to communicate the Gospel to all people that they may become members of the New Humanity, make evangelism a contemporary, transforming, revolutionary force. To achieve this, become incarnate in the people among whom you labor, winning a right to be heard because of what they find you to be.

Whatever your specific office or task may become in the worldwide community of Christ, in this land or in other lands,—whether you be a preacher, a teacher or an administrator; serving on a college campus or in suburbia; in an industrial area, a rural countryside, or a city slum,—take the form of a servant and have the heart of a friend.

In so doing, and till travelling days are done, may you sense the reality of

God's presence and the grip of his Hand. Knowing that Christ's Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, that he is Lord of all, and will have the last word in history, be willing to bear your cross and to tread rough paths.

And wherever your lot may be cast, be it:

"'Mid scenes of deepest gloom,
or where Eden bowers bloom,
by waters calm or troubled sea,"

live and work to the sonorous strains of Handel's Chorus:

"He shall reign forever—and ever—and ever."

JESUS' TEACHING

What is important concerning the originality of Jesus' teaching is not the amount of new material, whether great or small, which he brought; it is the way in which he has linked this teaching with a new religious conception and a new religious experience. The end of all ethical teaching is not knowledge but action. Everyone recognizes the chief problem is how to change knowledge into performance. The important element in the ministry of Jesus is that he inspired others to follow his teaching.

How is one to explain the dynamic quality in his message? To this question no final answer is possible, but it is not difficult to perceive that the power of his teaching was partly due, at any rate, to his intense realization of the reality of what he taught. The truths might themselves be old, but no one before him had grasped them with such absolute conviction. Others had applied the name "Father" to God, but the point is that when Jesus called God "Father" he knew him as the Father. He was able to communicate to others his personal assurance of the truth of what he taught.

A second reason which accounts in great measure for Jesus' power as a teacher is that he so identified himself with his teaching that obedience to it became a matter of personal loyalty to him. There are few who can follow an abstract ideal; all are capable of devotion to a person. It was the supreme achievement of Jesus as a teacher that he exemplified in himself all that he taught. Thus he made it possible for men to identify the moral law with a personal leader who evokes their love and confidence. The ultimate secret of Jesus' originality and power is intimately related to who is and what he accomplished in behalf of his followers.

—Bruce M. Metzger, in *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*,
Abingdon Press, 1965, p. 166.

THE CHRISTIAN IMPERATIVE

JAMES I. McCORD

Words of Farewell to the Members of the Graduating Class 1965 by the
President of the Seminary
Touch me not . . . but go. John 20:17

Let the words of the Risen Lord addressed to a converted sinner be the text of my farewell remarks to the Class of 1965.

In the dim twilight of Easter morn Mary Magdalene was wandering about in the Garden, disconsolate, believing God was dead and wondering where his body had been laid. In the gloom she mistook her Lord for the gardener and inquired, "Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." Then Jesus spoke her name, "Mary." "Rabboni," she answered, while evidently making some effort to hold on to him, but Jesus responded in words which should be a life-long text for each of us, "Touch me not . . . but go!" Do not stand clinging to me in the mist of the resurrection dawn, "but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God."

Why such cryptic words as a text for a life of ministry? Let me suggest three reasons. First of all, our Lord is saying that the Christian life is an imperative, an imperative to go and not to cling, to move out rather than to remain shut up within the house of the Lord. We are compelled to turn toward the needs of the world instead of being limited to the things of religion.

I remember visiting Lincoln Cathedral in the spring of 1951, situated on

an eminence overlooking the city and the surrounding countryside. A friend showed me the homes of the Dean and the Canons and explained how life within the close is regulated by the daily offices and the ringing of the cathedral bells. Life seemed simple there, and one could not help feeling that many decisions would be eliminated and ambiguities resolved if only he could remain within the precincts of the cathedral close. But I made the mistake of walking over to the edge and looking down into the valley below, where hundreds of homes were built side by side, each with smoke curling out of its chimney pot, and I could almost hear the familiar words of our Lord being addressed to me, "Do not cling to me here, but go into the valley below." It is not on the hill but below in the grime and smoke of the valley that life is lived, battles are fought, and victories are won.

Again, there is the instruction, "go to my brethren." We have been talking a great deal in Seminary about the weakness of an introverted Gospel and Church, and the whole thrust of theology today is toward reorienting the Church to the world. Each of you takes a firm determination into your ministry to break the bonds of old structures, to overcome every attempt to domesticate and institutionalize the Church, and to take the reconciling love of Christ into

the world. "The least of these my brethren" you will take more seriously than the things of religion, because it is among them that Christ is already present in His reconciling love.

Recall how St. Mark puts it in the resurrection chapter of his Gospel: "He goeth before you into Galilee." Galilee was for Jesus, a first century Jew, a place of toil and struggle, of suffering and misunderstanding. But this is precisely where he leads us, and into every Galilee we enter we have the assurance that the prevenient Lord has gone before.

Finally, there is the content of the message to his disciples, "I ascend unto my Father." This was Jesus' announcement of the completion of his earthly ministry and of his installation into his Kingship. And this is the burden of our proclamation. Men are no longer

to be juggled about by blind and secondary forces, intimidated by the threats under which they stand, but the basis of new life and freedom has come through the One who now reigns as Lord of life and death.

And this will be your confidence throughout all the decades ahead. Often you will be tempted to cling to the things of religion and to hide behind a stained glass curtain, but you will always go forth into the world in the wake of the prevenient Lord who has come and is coming.

I salute you as you begin your ministries with all the excitement that is ahead. Men everywhere should be envious of you today for the challenges which you will face, the way you will walk, and the assurance of faith that will undergird you all your days.

PREACHING

In the effort to familiarize myself with a little of the vast literature of the Christian pulpit two of my firmest convictions came into sharper focus.

One of them is that to the ever-changing panorama of the years the Word of God, properly understood, never has to be made relevant. Too much honest, misguided toil has been devoted to that. The Word of God is already relevant. It was relevant before we arrived on the scene. The honest toil is called for as one seeks to understand it, and by understanding it to apprehend its relevance. All it asks is that instead of being adjusted to the modern situation, or exploited to ends it never had in mind, it be allowed to address, at this time and in this place, what is most deeply characteristic of human existence.

The other unshaken conviction is that there is not today, there never has been, and there never will be any adequate substitute for preaching. The correspondence between the greatness or the wretchedness of the whole Christian enterprise, when one rightly conceives of them, and the fidelity and faithlessness of the Christian pulpit is from age to age altogether too obvious for anybody to miss it.

—Paul Scherer, in *The Word God Sent*, Harper & Row, 1965, p. xi.

THE GOD BEYOND THEOLOGY

BYRANT M. KIRKLAND

It is a pleasant assignment to confront our difficult times and consider with you that the motivation of this graduating class is from the God beyond theology—the God whom we know in part, as though we looked into a mirror dimly, but whom we shall know fully some day even as now we are known by him. While no man has seen God at any time, yet Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, for I and the Father are one." That is our clue.

As I was wrestling with this subject, I saw the theme unfold in what could have been a photograph. I was walking down the street near the Fifth Avenue Church when I saw a strange sight. A man was standing still in bustling New York. He was bending low at the curb, with his hands at his face, looking down to examine the gutter. As I stopped to behold him, I noticed that other busy New Yorkers hastened on with their feet but cast their curious glances backward to observe the same mysterious gentleman at the curb.

From a safe viewpoint across the street, I perceived that his hands at his face held a camera. He was taking a picture of the gutter at his feet where a small mirrorlike pool of recent rain had gathered. At my feet also was a small pool, so I looked down. To my delighted surprise, I saw what he saw—the spire of the church and its cross reflected in the bacteriological film on the street. "That's it," I mused. People do not look to the sky any more for the God they do not know. They have to find God incarnate in the gutter. The

God in the sky we have never known, or never seen except in his incarnate Son, must become reincarnate in our ministries in the gutter where men bend in despair and walk in their pain. If perchance there is no gentle rain to form that mirror, then the mirror must be formed by our tears of compassion and exhausted concern.

Faith in a Relativistic Age

While I am very happy to be here to bring this message, nevertheless I have had a certain amount of anxiety in preparing to face you. You have caused me no little trouble in these years since my own joy of becoming a graduate of this same institution. As I have read your journals of student opinion, I have suffered your burden of the relativism that you are going through—the comparative relevancy and the irrelevant relativisms of life. However, it is harder on older men than on you graduates to ask what is our basic message to preach in this kind of a world. It is difficult to present the God we do not know, the God beyond theology, the God no man has ever seen in such a manner as to be an effective instrument in an environment that is hostile and even vocative in its dubiety. However, it is noteworthy that your baccalaureate service is being celebrated on Pentecost. To add even more dimension to our thoughts from Holy Scripture and our consciences on this memorable day, two American space men are orbiting their way around the earth in a dimension your fathers never dreamed. This fact

itself adds more reason to your mood of relativism so that even your past relativism now becomes even more relativistic!

For comfort in confronting our radically changed generation, I picked up the essays of Werner Heisenberg, who succeeded the distinguished Albert Einstein, and read *A Physicist's Conception of Nature*. I figured if I were going to speak to this generation I might as well read from someone who really knew what relativistic physics was. I was strangely moved to find a religious note in his last chapter, where he was talking about faith. In this relativistic age, when the men and women you will be serving in some form or another want certitude when there appears to be none, conviction when there is none, confidence when there seems to be none, he says we still need faith. Faith is not an apperception of the truth. Rather, faith is an attitude by which we move out to find the truth in its ever-changing forms and shapes as it develops before us.

I think we can see the picture of this ever-changing relativism as the space-men whirl about in their Gemini craft in beautiful elliptical relationships to the earth, which itself is spinning on its axis, while moving ahead speedily at 70,000 miles per hour. And all the other planets are moving in their corresponding courses. But that breath-taking sense of relativity does not mean that we need stand with empty hands and cry out to our relativistic generation, "We have no relevant message. We are not sure of anything." Somehow, as one of your own faculty members has said, "We must understand that God is not a conception; he is an experience." It is not enough to be graduated from this

seminary with a learned understanding of theology. It is essential also to have had an experience of the God beyond theology. Any layman can read the same books that we have read for information. But the real test of faith is whether or not we have met the unseen God on the road where people walk with eager hearts despite daily pain and frequent disappointment with much of our preoccupying formalism and ecclesiastical embroidery.

The poignant opportunity of today's world offers us the choice whether we shall have a non-ministry or, if you will follow me, a ministry of non-ministry. A "non-ministry" minister is one who has set himself free to follow the spirit of the living God whom we cannot contain nor comprehend save as we find him glimpsed in Jesus, the Scriptures, in the history of the Church and in conscience ever leading us on. In this "non-ministry" we can have a great ministry of the spirit. But if we are proud, vain, and comfortable to think we have it made professionally, then this rigid ministry will become a service of non-ministry without healing quality, without light, without hope.

I selected the 40th chapter of Isaiah to be the inspiration of our meditation because I think this was probably written in a similar time of dubiety and uncertainty as our own. Men and women had the memory of the Babylonian experience when they were forced to "sing us a song" and could not remember their old songs in a strange land. Out of this passage comes the timeless comfort of God's renewing strength. "Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God (beyond theology), the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is

weary? There is no searching of his understanding. He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might He increaseth strength. Even the youths (graduates) shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall: But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint" (Isaiah 40:28:-31).

I wish I could say to you that I am more of a Hebrew scholar than when I left seminary, but I still look up the beauty of Hebrew words. That word "wait" has nothing to do with the idiom of today where one sits in a telephone booth and waits for an answer, or stands on a corner to wait for a bus, or watch in a theatre even for Godot. Waiting in this Biblical sense is (as I understand the primitive root) patient labor as twisting twine. Immediately there comes to my mind a picture of a citizen in Latin America sitting by the road with a long leaf blade of one of those fibrous bayonet plants. He had beaten off the pulp of the leaf to find the fiber of its central structure and veins. Then he twisted these into a thread and wove the threads together into cords and the cords into a rope. All of it was the simple relation of little fibers twisted into a binding unity, making a cable. The chemical elements of the sun and the earth had been caught up into the plant and then its fiber had become a rope, and that rope enabled one to fling it to a rock and scale a mountain, or else to tie a pack around one's shoulders and carry a burden. This is the existential experience of waiting on God in the midst of relativism with such a relatedness that progressively finds the God beyond our

theology in the process of carrying life's burdens and scaling the mountains of difficulty.

The Majesty of God Can be Known only in Part

I am concerned about and have struggled with a question which I'm sure you have too. How do we ministers relate to this kind of a world of relativistic thinking? One thing we must realize is that we do not *have* God. We believe God has us! We do not *have* a Gospel. We are *participants* in a Gospel. As soon as we say to this struggling world, with its doubt and relativism, "I have God; I have a Gospel," then we *had* God, we *had* a Gospel. But in the meantime he has moved on in his dealing with the world of constant change.

Think of it in terms of the present tense of living with this One who speaks when and where he wills, and comes in any form or fashion that he chooses. This is what another member of the Seminary community has called "the ongoing Reformation." It is the on-going Gospel. It is the on-revealing of God to us, whom we know in part but never fully comprehend. Our sense of God is an experience. Our experience of God is in following him. This following of God is a dialogue.

This is what the eminent Dr. Tillich spoke about. This is the God who comes to us when his spirit reaches to our spirit in the existentialism of forgiveness. He comes in the desperation of any modern preacher who dares to face an intelligent audience and speak their love, speak their doubts, and speak their aspirations. God comes to man in the defeats he must suffer and enables him to rise again with new strength to bear his load. The God beyond theology is

the infinite One to whom we keep open in order that we may find him in the experiences of life.

Now this is good motivating religion because the kind of world in which you and I are living is one that wants this kind of a God. But people are also afraid we don't have this spiritual adventure, and even more afraid that we'll insist that we do have it when we have lost it.

I was very much profited to read *The Failure of Theology in Literature* by John Killinger (of recent graduation from the Seminary) in which he describes how literature over the last thirty or more years has been reflecting the respectable secret doubts of the world into which you are being ushered. The terms writers use which have disturbed us and other people are "the absent God," or more currently phrased, the "God is dead" movement.

Dr. Killinger cites a reference to the term in Aldous Huxley's piece where the savage and the Controller are looking at the Bible, the *Varieties of Religious Experience*, and the *Imitation*. The savage says, "They still believe these things? You believe there is no God?" And the Controller of the earth says, "I believe there is a God, but he's absent." This is the feeling of many people. They are trying to get away from the concept of a dynamic God by trying to find some God that can be contained in an idol spread with gold and silver chains or enshrined in a mechanical principle. They are not able to understand a God who moves in his own mysterious creative personal ways.

Or, take the acid writings of Sinclair Lewis, how he said that there can be "no starched Presbyterianism for me." He made light in one novel of that man

who was a member in a church, but no true believer. While the amiable and comfortable member did not believe in God, yet when his brother Ben died, he felt obligated to say his compulsive prayers sixteen times at night while he held his breath! The confused man intimated he did not dare go to sleep otherwise, yet he found no solace in God.

There are other people like that—rigid people who need to be released from their bondage in the church. Also, there are people outside the church who cry out in desperation, as Camus and others, for a living God who transcends the so-called God we carry in our ecclesiastical back pocket, the God that we can debate, as if he didn't overshadow us with his absolute command to "follow me."

Killinger goes on to relate how once you have that type of regard for the God concept, then, naturally, the church comes under the sharp criticism it has experienced in recent years. We are not altogether insensitive to its sharpness, for some of its caustic observations are justified. One of the unmarked challenges before this class is to pray to the on-moving Lord to discover how the church can find the way out of its lethargy.

But now the ministry itself has come under sharp criticism, too, as well as the church. You may have read *The Stained Glass Jungle*. It is a story of the ministry told in Methodist terms. A young minister is planning to marry a District Superintendent's daughter. (That certainly was a very thoughtful thing to do.) He is discussing a call with his father-in-law, the Rev. Mr. Fred Worthington. He piously mentions that the Holy Spirit is guiding

him, when Mr. Worthington breaks in with a jarring interruption, saying, "The Holy Spirit has nothing to do with the assigning of the larger churches, that's taken care of by the wealthy and prominent men." Then, catching himself, he adds, "But of course, the Holy Spirit has a lot more to do with the middle-sized and smaller churches." The obvious spiritual rebuke in this feeling for our frailty as ministers is why people are buying a new book called *How to Become a Bishop without Being Religious*. This is all part of the world of doubt, relativism and uncertainty where we are called to follow the God beyond theology.

But, we accept the world with its relativism! It need not terrify us. The Lord Jesus accepted the same relativism in his day. At one period he was in the carpenter's shop working creatively on the wood and at the end of his life he was nailed impotently to the wood. Another time he poured the wine at a wedding banquet to make merry and at another moment he poured the last cup and said, "Drink this cup in remembrance of me;" and it was the wine of his blood. All his short life he walked the dusty road giving compassion to sweaty sufferers and then in the last hour under the blazing sun, he himself received compassion from a hard but wondering centurion, who held up a reed with a sponge dipped in vinegar and said, "Truly this is the Son of God."

You and I will never be what we were yesterday and we can never come back to today. Your world will change, your ministry will change, your Gospel (in effect) will change, but it will always be an apperception of the Eternal, the One who said, "Have you not

known? Have ye not heard from the beginning, there is no searching of my understanding? I give power to people when they faint. I give power to people when they are weak. They shall mount up with wings as eagles, or run, and eventually if they bind the cord of their fealty to me they shall slip the rope harness on their shoulders and walk with their load and not faint."

We envy you graduates with your discovered Gospel. We envy you with your energy of youth. We envy you with the things that God has yet to declare to you that have not yet been revealed to the children of men for we are not living in a closed-end revelation.

The Absence of God is Still Presence

I think I can detect something of the mind of a big city and the hunger of its human hearts. I think I sense the excitement of a living Christ who is the very focus of the God beyond theology, the signet ring impression of his magnificence. It is that Christ who tells us of the God who comes not only as the present God, but also as one writer said, "The absent God whose presence is felt in his absence." In the current issue of *The Christian Scholar* appears this sentence: "It is not an absence of his presence that we are experiencing, but it is the presence of his absence we are experiencing."

Something of the meaning of this can be seen in the story of Samson playing with Delilah. He would let her tie his wrists and then smirk when she clapped her hands to bring in the guards. He would pop his bands and smite their heads together laughing as if he were showing off in a bar room before an admiring crowd. But one day, you recall,

Delilah wheedled him into telling the secret of his dedication. Then she tied his wrists and shaved his long hair, which symbolized his relation to God. She gently prodded him on the cheek, saying, "Samson, wake up, thine enemies be upon thee!" I can see those large shoulders and thighs ripple as he stood up, laughed and said, "I will go out as at other times and smite them." Then follows one of the most poignant verses of the Bible, "He wist not that the spirit of God had departed from him and they put out his eyes so that he ground meal, eyeless in Gaza." There is the presence of the absent God. That is the God we have tolerated and played with when we have forsaken him by forsaking the lustrous Christ and His commanding spirit in the very existence of the present. The absent God is ministering to us now even as he ministered to Samson and later ministered to both Saul of Israel and Saul of Tarsus. The God who is present in his absence (which is our blindness) is calling the Church back to a renewal which needs to be more than academic and formal. It will not come academically and formally. It will have to come in the broken hearts of young men and women and older men and women following the present spirit of the Lord. It is going to come in the haunting breaking of our pride.

(I had an idea for you. I wish they would stop publishing General Assembly statistics on congregations. Wouldn't it be helpful just to list the name of the congregation, such as First Church, Bound Brook, and then the names of the minister and clerk of Session? That might set us free from the pride of statistics. Likewise, it might also be well for us to prepare to earn

our livings outside of the ministry, not by making tents as St. Paul, but in some way or other so that we might be free to follow the eternal creatively into the present and not have to depend on the churches for salaries.)

Perhaps the great things of God are still ahead of us, as they were for the church when his spirit struck Wesley in an age of lethargy.

God is speaking not only by his majesty, but he is also speaking in the presence of his absence. Finally, the God beyond theology is speaking in the need of himself and of mankind to meet in revelation relationship. Read the experience of the past how in Scripture and holy history he has spoken to young men and women graduates, to mothers, sweethearts and wives—all of you who have something vital at stake in this graduation. Is the hand of the Lord hindered that he cannot act again? Read of the past actions of the Eternal one and keep your hearts open to listen even when he seems not to speak to us. As Tillich said, he is still present even when he is not speaking. God is present with us even when we do not seek his presence.

The Recovery of God is an Authentic Discipleship

By our responding concern and our compassionate obedience, struggling men and women of our time may still find the God beyond theology. The God beyond theology is the Eternal in your experience. He is known by following Jesus Christ, whom to see is to see the Father and whom to know is to be in the midst of eternal life.

For you graduates I pray great blessings. I pray for you to have strength to follow your relativisms and to grow

in your relativisms. But, you need not faint, you need not give up, you need not say "the ministry is no longer valid." You need not say, "The church is no longer relevant." You need not scrap everything you believe and experience. Everything is in its own changing relationship to the One who enwraps all things into his own dynamic existence. You and I need to match faith with the strength of men like Marcus Whitman who marched across the country from the Northwest Territories to walk into Congress when Daniel Webster was saying of the Pacific Northwest area, "We do not want that dustbowl wasteland up there." Presbyterian Marcus Whitman, not yet 45, said, "It is a glorious country to be claimed and to be used." They retorted, "You cannot drive a wagon up there." He said, "I drove a wagon up there! And I have just finished walking back from there in four months, although I was lost for fifteen hundred miles on the way."

Likewise, when the First World War was over, Fridtjof Nansen was a man of courage. The Russians would not cooperate in freeing some of the prisoners. They did not want to deal with the League of Nations, so Nansen said, "I'll resign my commission and do the work as an individual." He liberated 417,000 prisoners of war. When there were no funds for their transportation,

he said, "I will raise the funds for it." Others despaired, saying, "It will cost \$200 a person." But he raised funds sufficiently at \$8 per person to transport all the men home. In further aggravation, some dilettantes said, "We won't let the repatriates through our borders because they have no passports." Nansen then had his own visage engraved on paper and stamped his name to give documents to those who were stateless. Men such as Whitman and Nansen are those who worship and serve the eternal God who is known to us in the experience of following Jesus Christ in the midst of today's demanding relativism.

Only four years ago on this very Pentecost day in Manhattan, the late Dag Hammarskjold opened his diary and wrote down the date and penned, "I know not who nor what called me, but I heard and answered by saying 'yes' to Someone. And ever since I said 'yes' to Someone, I have felt the meaningful sense of my existence that through surrender, my life can count."

We cannot search out God by our understanding, yet he giveth power to the faint. He renews the strength of those that wait on him to follow his spirit every day. Brethren, blessings be on you. Wait on the Lord and be of good cheer. You shall serve him well who is eternal in a relativistic world.

A NEW COMMANDMENT

HAROLD N. ENGLUND

Two qualifications for the ordained ministry that are not always stressed in seminary catalogs are: an ability to work in the midst of conflict, and an ability to love one's fellow-ministers. The two abilities are not unrelated.

The text is found in the Fourth Gospel, chapter 13, verses 34 and 35. "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another; even as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love to one another."

Jesus was about to depart from the company of his followers, and his tiny Church, still in its formative period, would have to pass through the crisis of succession in leadership. Every great movement must eventually go through this sort of crisis. The leader whose vision gave birth to the movement is withdrawn, and it then becomes clear how much of his vision can be transferred to his successors.

Looking about him, Jesus saw a handful of quite ordinary men. They were neither "poor" nor "ignorant" when compared with the standards of their time, but they were still quite ordinary. Already there were strains in the fellowship. James and John, whom Jesus himself had nicknamed "sons of thunder," had secretly sought positions of honor in the coming Kingdom; one may have wished to be Secretary of State and the other Secretary of the Interior. Peter, the natural leader, was afflicted with a bad case of "foot-in-

mouth disease," and he would shortly deny his Lord and disgrace himself. Matthew, the former collaborator with the Roman occupation, was expected to share life in the band of the Twelve with Simon the Nationalist. And Judas Iscariot, bitter and disillusioned, was drifting ever nearer the abyss of betrayal. If the Twelve could be regarded as the first congregation of the Church, it was far from an ideal congregation.

The disciples had had some sharp arguments. The very Upper Room scene had opened with a dispute on who should sit where. And after Jesus' departure, a whole host of thorny questions would have to be resolved. Who should act as leader? Should the Gentiles be permitted to enter the Church? What was the status of the covenant with Israel? How should discipline be exercised? What kind of organization would be needed to match the Church's territorial expansion? What kind of leadership would be needed after the apostles had died? How should the Church conduct itself under civil persecution?

The only thing that could keep this group of men together and united in their given mission was mutual love and respect. A fellowship marked by authentic love was necessary to accredit the message, which was one of authentic love. The love commanded by Jesus was grounded in his love for them all, and in their relationship to one another in him.

But if diversity and tension were ap-

parent in the community of faith at the beginning, how much more is this true now! Today the household of God includes millions of people living in many nations, conditioned by many cultures, enjoying vastly different standards of living, standing up to varying kinds of pressure. The Church exists in the midst of confessional differences, liturgical variations, polity disagreements, cultural misunderstandings, as well as suspicion, fear, and just plain cussedness. But the world to be redeemed through the Church's faithful presence and witness is scarred by these same gashes. The need for a ministry of reconciliation is beyond dispute. But to be a reconciler, the Church must first be reconciled within its own ranks.

The burden of my concern, however, is not the ecumenical movement as such, though the ecumenical implications should become obvious as we move along. My burden is something much simpler, less sophisticated, less theoretical. I wish to take the words of Jesus in our text in their most direct and literal meaning and apply them to the relations we ministers sustain to one another.

One has not been in the ordained ministry long before he becomes aware of a regrettable hollowness in ministerial fellowship. There seems to be an inability to appreciate a brother's contribution to the Kingdom, an unawareness of the interdependence of ministers and churches on one another, and sometimes an appalling failure in the elementary graces of charity and kindness. Why is this so? Admitting that we ministers are plain, garden-variety sinners like other mortals, could there be some structural defects in the Church that bring out the worst in us?

In the first century, the Church sustained some kind of a relationship to geographical place. We read of "the Church in Antioch," "the Church in Corinth," "the Church in Rome." We do not read of two fellowships of Christians in the same community out of fellowship with each other. The Good News was sounded in a given community, and whoever responded in faith constituted the Church in that community. When differences arose within the Church, they were contained and worked at and put up with; no serious thought was given to forming subdivisions around the differing viewpoints. Fractures nearly developed at Ephesus and at Corinth, but the vigorous leadership of St. Paul prevented such an outcome.

Geographical expansion eventually led to the parish-diocesan system, whereby the Church accepted responsibility for the entire known world, or at least for all of Europe. This arrangement even survived the Reformation in the lands of northern and western Europe, since the Reformers did not contemplate rupturing the connection between Church and geography.

It was really the great European immigration to the New World that swept the parish system into the discard. The Petersons from St. Stephen's parish church in Stockholm joined the Trinity Lutheran Church in Minneapolis, thinking they were uniting in the New World with the Church of Christ as they had known it in Sweden. They were mistaken. Somewhere on the high seas the mysterious transformation took place. They left a form of the Church that identified with the whole of Sweden, and in particular, with a known section of residential Stockholm. They

found in Minneapolis a form of the Church with no parish other than an ethnic clientele, one bound to disappear with the process of Americanization.

Or, one can compare the Hervormde Kerk of the Netherlands with the Reformed Church in America to see the same process at work. Today, the Hervormde Kerk is undergoing a process of renewal and is relating itself to the concerns of the nation—economic, political, social, artistic, educational. The Reformed Church in America, lumped into several sections of the United States, is bleeding on the periphery of its geographical concentrations and is rather defensively trying to maintain its present status when the peculiar reason for a separate existence has passed. When one realizes the number of denominations which have ethnic origins, the problem comes into focus.

The nature of the congregation is different in the American *milieu*. No longer related to a known area, no longer identifying itself inclusively with all who live in such an area, it becomes a fellowship based on compatibility, or social homogeneity. It is less like a fire station responding to calls in its district than a dentist or a doctor building a clientele around himself without regard for area.

This has yielded the clientele church, and its chief feature, aside from social homogeneity, is its minister-centered character. This centering on the minister moves the man of God into a very exposed position. His gifts become a marketable quantity. One New York City congregation has even computed the financial loss to the church of having its senior pastor out of the pulpit for one Sunday! The minister's prophetic courage can be met with finan-

cial reprisal. But important for our love command is that his success involves a kind of competition with his brothers, and this tends to isolate him from the logical source of pastoral care for his own life, his brother pastor.

The nature of the congregation is further affected. Since it has no known area of responsibility, it has no parish. Not able to feel responsible for a definite bit of the world which God loves in Christ, it comes to feel responsible for its own members. And to hold its members, it structures a womb-to-tomb program designed to keep them busy within the cage. Its membership list is its parish. And if the members re-locate, the church follows them without a pang of conscience in leaving an area of a city without a witness. The congregation is transformed from an instrument for mission in the community to a self-feeding ecclesiastical club.

During a brief period of service as acting President of Western Seminary in Michigan, I came to understand how many lonely, isolated pastors there were, and how great a problem was ministerial morale. Lateral lines of pastoral shepherding among ministerial colleagues were simply not being adequately used. One man struggling with a teen-age daughter who was breaking his heart, another going through a crisis in his understanding of his Christian faith, another with a deteriorating marriage, another with a financial problem that was pushing him under—these were some of the burdens carried by men who felt, rightly or wrongly, that they could not share.

Early in my ministry, I tried to learn to know the new pastors and their wives who moved into the area where I served. Mrs. Englund and I enjoyed

having each new couple to our home on a Sunday evening for a friendly visit. I recall a rural couple who came over, somewhat puzzled by our invitation, and how during the course of the evening they gradually relaxed and found freedom to share some of the highlights of their rural pastorates. This was a new world to us, and we thoroughly enjoyed the hilarity of counseling via party lines, feast-or-famine in the pastor's freezer, and other tales of rural Americana. Months later at a Classis meeting, this brother gave me his hand and with tears said these words, which I shall never forget, "No one has ever been interested in my ministry before." And I thought, what have we been doing to our brothers?

Since that experience, I have attempted to learn to know my colleagues in my community, and the fun of exploring the by-ways of churchly traditions and outlooks has been beyond telling. I commend it to you with all my heart.

The long and the short of it is that we ministers have a responsibility for one another. And the "strong" must take the initiative to relate to the "weak," if I may use such terms. The tragic results of ministers collapsing under intolerable loads are an indictment on us all. Somewhere we are failing to implement Jesus' love command.

It may be that what is called for is a bishop, but I am not sure. A bishop's office and title does not ensure a bishop's heart and function. The willingness to be a servant of the servants of God is a gift of the Holy Spirit and an insight that lies close to the heart. I doubt that it can be structured very successfully in ecclesiastical terms.

In Berkeley, six of us who serve

churches adjacent to the University of California, meet monthly to share our concerns and to rescue one another from the slough of despond. This is perhaps the closest ministerial fellowship I have. Then the five Presbyterian churches identify with one another in a common sense of mission, and the pastors of these five churches meet in a Clericus once each month. At the weekly Staff luncheon in First Church, we frequently have other pastors, campus ministers, and religious leaders of every hue and view present, simply because such an open-ended fellowship respects something real about the Church as it is. Even in the Presbytery, we should try to recapture some of the original meaning of that august body, wherein ministers, by belonging to the Presbytery rather than to a single congregation, share responsibility together for all the churches of the Presbytery.

Sometimes I drive to the top of the hills and look over the city of Berkeley, with its great University, its businesses and factories, its schools and churches, and its 110,000 residents, and I try to imagine what I would feel like were I a bishop (forbid the thought!) of the city, responsible for all of its people, and especially for all of its ministers and their families, and for the churches they serve. How would my attitude toward my brothers differ from my present attitude? This difference is the measure of God's judgment on my present ministry.

Perhaps one day when the Church has been sufficiently united confessionally and politically, it will be possible to break it up again, this time geographically. And if parishes cannot be reconstituted now that job and home are separated by great distances, it may

be possible to build small dioceses with lines of relationship and responsibility primarily oriented within the given identity of an urban area. If the Church's message is given by her Lord, perhaps her form must be given by the world, at least in part.

Until that time, lines of shepherding will have to be built spontaneously and imaginatively by those who see the need and have the wit to innovate. If the Cup of Holy Communion cannot yet be shared throughout the fellowship of the Body of Christ, we may be able to begin with a proto-Communion, the cup of coffee. More misunderstanding is soluble in coffee than this world dreams of. This kind of ecumenical "preparatory service" will have to come before an ecumenical sacrament.

How shall we implement the love command as ministers of the Gospel? Let me offer a suggestion or two.

Come to terms with what it means to be a member of the household of God. There is a givenness about the family of faith that must be seen and respected. We no more choose our brothers in Christ than we choose our brothers and sisters in our families. They are given us by our parents. Some may annoy us, some may delight us, but they are all ours. The Church Catholic is a given thing. We are related to all of it, to

the parts that are weak and to the parts that are strong, to the immature as well as to the mature, to the fundamentalist as well as to the sophisticated.

And speaking of the fundamentalist, if we are to relate helpfully to the Negro congregations in our great cities, and to our Roman Catholic brothers, we must learn how to handle fundamentalism with patience rather than with scorn. Let us take care that the ecumenical "line" does not become another exclusive sectarianism, intolerant of other accents. There is a subtle temptation to become psychologically dependent on our targets, and to need to live in estrangement from parts of the Body of Christ. I would encourage you to accept with eyes wide open the whole family of faith.

Then, seek to cultivate a sensitive set of ecclesiastical reflexes. The grace of hospitality, the listening ear, the shared burden in intercession, the exploring of ideas, the touch of humor, the showing of interest in a brother's work—by such simple and presently accessible ways may the love command be obeyed.

The force of the command is the lordship of him who gave it. The measure of the love commanded is the measure of his love for us. And the result of obedience is that all men might know that we are his disciples.

Prayer: O Lord Jesus Christ, King and Head of the Church, we acknowledge the household of faith as created by thy love, and as aided in its health and mission through our love—for one another, as well as for thee and for the world.

Forgive us our insensitivity in the presence of a brother's burden. Forgive us our empire-building instincts so far removed from thy willingness to wash thy disciples' feet. Forgive our tongues that so often speak unhelpfully. Kindle a new sense of disciplined responsibility for one another that is rooted in obedience to thy love command. Give us lightness of heart in our service, assured that we do not serve alone.

Blessing and honor, glory and power be unto thee, O God, who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. Amen.

TOWARD THE CHRISTIAN CAPTIVATION OF THE SUBURBS

SEWARD HILTNER

THE title of these remarks has an intention in addition to the obvious play on words with the title of the book by Gibson Winter. By analogy, it asks whether we can reason from health to illness as well as from illness to health. Books like Gibson Winter's move from exposition of "illness," or what is wrong with the suburbs, to a good deal about "health," what might make the suburbs better. They are by no means merely negative. Yet they do play it safe with that Philistine-like trend of American culture whose motto is, "Don't be a sucker; don't stick out your neck!" The positive suggestions that appear may then be regarded as silver linings, but one's reputation, so to speak, is not dependent upon them.

It occurred to me that the reversal of the usual method of examining the suburban situation might shed some new light both on the nature of the problem and its possible solution. If we begin with a positive, which must of course be a hypothetical positive, could we see things even about the problem that would not otherwise be clearly visible? By the hypothetical positive I mean this: *What would the suburbs look like if they were captured by Christian faith?* If we compel ourselves to state and articulate our own vision in reply to this question, my guess is that we can deal more critically with the vision itself, and also perhaps get a clearer view of the actual problems and potentialities.

Since I am not, like Frederick A. Shippey and others leading this consultation today, in any sense an expert on the suburbs, it would be foolish for me to attempt a direct analysis even from the point of view of the positive question as already stated. But if I take an oblique approach through something I am supposed to know something about, I believe the result may be just as relevant and is rather more likely to have some meaning.

The oblique approach I shall follow is through the family. It is impossible to put together two sentences about the suburbs without mentioning the family. But ordinarily, when the main focus is on the suburbs, the frequent and inevitable references to the family tend to become the "ideal" part of the picture while the suburbs as such are presented as the "actual" part. Or, if you will permit the analogy, in such discourse the family is presented as the "hero" and the suburbs as the "villain." The family becomes the "good guy" and the suburbs, the "bad guy." The conclusion that often emerges—that the more family or family life, the better the suburbs might become—then tends not in itself to be critically analyzed. We may end with a season of flag-waving for the family, and then go home for dinner thanking God that our family, even if in the suburbs, is not suburban.

Of course I agree that much in the possible future of the suburbs will rest upon what happens to the family. And

the family, some kind of family, might well turn out to be the "good guy." But not just any family. Like the suburbs themselves, the family is ambiguous. Hence the one chance of helping it to become the good guy is to analyze it critically. The opportunity of the church in the suburbs may rest fully as much upon our ability to give critical reflection to the family as upon our capacity to analyze the suburban situation in itself.

To be sure, not all families are in the suburbs. An analysis of the family in the suburbs is not, therefore, equivalent to a complete analysis of the family in American life. And yet, increasingly, the dominant patterns of the family are being set by the family in the suburbs. Hence, critical analysis of the suburban family is the most important kind of family study that can be made today. And since I believe also that the greatest current frontier of the church lies in the suburbs—the ministry and message of the church may well stand or fall by what is done in the suburbs—the analysis of the suburban family becomes of greatest importance to the future of the church.

For purposes of this discussion, it is assumed that the general movement we call "the suburbs" has developed as an effort to prevent the emergence of cities, of industry, of smoke, and of congestion from dictating necessarily, and in entirety, what are felt to be the over-all human values in actual living—with the notion of "actual living" focusing on family living. To put the same thing in more positive terms, the movement toward suburbs has been an attempt to present human living in its own right, with emphasis on living as a family-centered affair—with other

matters, such as work and economic production, viewed as instrumental to actual living. So stated, it may be a point worthy of discussion if the trend toward suburbs contains a cryptic denigration of work in the sense of commitment and service to God as stressed by the Protestant Reformers. But whether that is true or not, the general trend toward suburbs is at least an effort to prevent the actual conditions of work and production from dominating everything about human living. The suburbs are, from a theoretical point of view, the opposite of company housing under the factory smoke stacks.

The Suburban Family Today

At no time in human history, so far as I know, and nowhere else on the face of the earth, has the family been understood or defined as it is today in American life, with the normative pattern being set in the suburbs. A family today is, normatively speaking: father, mother, children, *and nobody else*. Of course there are millions of other persons—grandparents, brothers, sisters, cousins, aunts, and others—who are permitted to "live with" families in our culture. But by the normative definition of the family, they are there on sufferance. They do not have inherent "rights of belonging." Their presence is often permitted. But even if every family contained some such persons, the fact would not produce a change in the normative notion of what a family really is.

Sociologists call this notion of the family the "nuclear family." While correct, such a term may unwittingly conceal the extent to which, as a pattern, this conception has emerged as unique in the history of the family. One kind

of opposite of this notion would be the old Chinese family, where the family is a large clan ruled by seniors, containing various kinds of "nuclei," but not simply a set of "nuclear families" within the larger family.

One attack on our normative definition of the American family has been made, owing to pragmatic necessity, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which acknowledges families consisting of a widow and children, a son living with mother, and even grandparents living with father, mother and children. But so far, Internal Revenue has not changed the general definition, even though, four times a year, it sticks closer than a brother and more sharply.

We are all familiar with the contracting functions of the family as western civilization has developed. Many kinds of functions once central to the family—economic, social, educational, and even religious—have been shifted to other social institutions. It is generally agreed that most families in the West including America run on two wheels, child-rearing and affection. But when these two wheels become narrower and narrower, which is another way of speaking of our current normative definition of the American family, then there is danger that the wheels can not support the weight without breaking. As the father-mother-children-and-nobody-else definition of the family has become normative, the intensity of relationships among these persons has become greater. In many instances this fact makes the Oedipus complex stickier and harder to resolve. It has shifted us into using the word "intimacy" as if it were synonymous with "sex relations." With the departure of the maiden sister and aunt

from normative belongingness in the family, with or without spinning wheel, there is movement away both from the pattern that previously attenuated enforced intimacy and concomitantly provided free baby-sitting service. The modern young mother looks with nostalgia at a previous age with built-in free baby sitters. But she would be the last to admit any notion of the family that included any other woman than herself as a full member.

Psychiatric experience suggests that intimacy in the proper, and not the debased sexual, sense is great stuff if you can manage it. The opposite of such intimacy would be either casualness or detachment in all relationships, or a patterned effort to avoid all intensities of feeling, *pro* or *con*. But what is unique about our current normative conception of the family is the degree of enforced intense intimacy. Our present degree may be fine for those who can manage it. But the more the norm pushes toward intensity, the more likely it is that there will be a larger number who are confounded by the ambiguities inherent in intensity of relationship. That seems to be exactly where we stand today.

In any culture, the persons who can hurt one most are those who are felt to be closest to him. And one way of finding out, in any culture, who is felt to be closest to you, is to ask how long you have to remain there with him and to what extent your relationship with him automatically excludes any meaningful relationships with anybody else. Most conceptions of the family, in most ages and cultures, have had various kinds of built-in safety valves against the negative aspects of enforced intensity. As our present normative

conception of the family has gained ascendancy, the safety valves have been cut off one after another. If you don't believe me, try, for instance, to lunch with a female parishioner who is not a professional woman; or find out that your son will talk seriously with your brother but not with you.

Nowhere is this enforced intensity of intimacy greater than in the suburbs. Nearly every "young family," i.e., husband and wife, would like to start there, and many do. Even if they are unable to start there, they dream of doing so and often plan toward a suburban move. With the present average age of women at first marriage at about twenty, there is a great strain upon the intensity pattern, and few safety valves. And all this takes place most often in families that either are in the suburbs or are planning to get there.

My discussion has certainly not exhausted the implications of the present normative definition of the family: father-mother-children-and-no-body-else. But I have tried to identify the main problem raised by the normative conception itself, namely, the ambiguity inherent in tightly enforced intensity and the absence of safety valves for those threatened by the degree of intensity.

So far I have dealt only with the formal question: the normative assumption about what a family is. When we turn to the related question, what quality of relationship is to exist in this family, we encounter even greater ambiguities.

From the point of view of normative relational quality, the American family has become "romantic." This term is not intended in the caricatured sense of a passionate hug at the end of a

movie, or the delusion that *Orgasmus vincit omnia*, or that budgets and in-laws will take care of themselves if only the spine tingles sharply enough. In my sense, a "romantic" view of the family is like the romance in the "romance languages," or like the romantic poetry of the nineteenth century, or like the romantic movement about nature as in Wordsworth or Thoreau. It is, in principal, a commitment to the importance of subjective feeling as revelatory of both objectivity and subjectivity, i.e., of reality. It believes in its feelings; and it need not be naive or caricatured in doing so.

So far as the family goes, there have been some very positive results of the romantic influence. Under its impact, the penultimate traces of "arranged marriage" have been done away with in our culture. True, there will still be fusses about the girl from the wrong side of the tracks, the boy with a different skin color, or the girl with a history of promiscuity or poverty. But, within such limits, the voluntary choice of marriage partner is generally acknowledged to be a good thing, and has come into human history only quite recently. Its principal cultural support is the romantic understanding of marriage.

Another positive result of the romantic conception of marriage is the increased sense of mutuality of responsibility between marital partners. This shows itself, for instance, in some aspects of sexual patterns. Prostitution is no longer supported by young and unmarried men. Upon marriage, most young men exercise for some years greater fidelity to their wives than in past ages. Despite the continuing jokes about the young man's being "hooked" by his bride, fewer young men, even at

shotgun weddings, feel "hooked." The young woman's articulation may still be more hope-cheisty than her husband's. But, much more than was normative before, he as well as she may feel a committed excitement about their new union. Marriage is life, not a cage out of which one plans advance escapes. The conscious commitment of young men, statistically speaking, to their marital partners, with or without psychological maturity to support the commitment, has certainly increased. This pattern began with college-educated men. As the Kinsey studies suggest, it is spreading out, especially because the average years of formal education are increasing for American men. Another way to put this is that, in some respects, suburban patterns are spreading beyond the suburbs. Even the erstwhile Beatnik may be more romantic, under the surface, than either he or we have suspected.

Within limits, the romantic pattern also manifests some respect for individuality on the part of a family. Of course the community will have definite and graded judgments about a family without a rumpus room, a television set, a power lawn-mower, a washing machine, an automobile. With courage, they can survive. But idiosyncrasy, in our romantic age, does certainly demand courage. Individuality is possible, but it carries a price tag.

Finally, among the benefits of the romantic view of the family, has come a general increase in what may be called the "social security" of the persons in the family structure. There are economic dimensions to this security. Real estate equities, life insurance, play yards for the children, and music lessons are all taken seriously. The deeper di-

mensions lie in the realm of "belongingness." Mrs. John Smith may not be, as in some European cultures, "Mrs. Bank Cashier Smith" or "Mrs. Pastor Smith," but her sense of both belonging and status may be little different from her European counterpart. Similarly, the Smith children may feel that it is something to be little Smiths because, despite the Smith-Senior fights from time to time, Pop and Mom really do love each other and dedicate themselves to little Smiths.

Unlike the nineteen twenties, a competent professional woman is handicapped if she has not reared some children with more or less success. A woman without children may still become a college president, but it is harder. Even a nun has a better chance if she has worked with children or young people, instead of confining herself to academic pursuits. All of this represents a startling shift since the nineteen twenties. Marriage is a badge, most obviously for women but also for men. It is a most unusual bachelor who makes it to higher echelons today, unless he is a priest. While this pattern contains built-in painfulness for the unmarried, the widowed, and the divorced, it does acknowledge in some basic way the importance of a marital and family tie; and, at least without the kickbacks, may be regarded as positive.

But the romantic pattern about marriage and family life has negative results as well as positive. In summary of the negative effects, it may be said that the pattern invites disillusionment because the cryptic selfishness contained in the basic commitment generally remains unacknowledged and unexposed by any one including the rep-

resentatives of the church, who should know and see better.

Here is John saying to Mary, "Your eyes are like the stars." In this he is in keeping with all the western generations. But, articulated or not, he also commits himself to having six children, two cars in due time, music lessons and college educations for his children, and perhaps membership in the country club. What he really means about his wife's eyes is that he loves her because she meets all his needs and wants. She reciprocates the full range of sentiments, needs, wishes, wants, and commitments. In these days, if we read her full underground state at the time of the romantic commitment, we might hear her say, "I love you too since you now meet all my needs and wants; but look, big boy, if you ever get off the straight and narrow, kindly remember that, owing to my prospective fecundity as a female with a ring, the law is more on my side than on yours."

In Kinsey's studies of sexual behavior, a fascinating finding was the variation in patterns of sexual marital fidelity among men of different social classes. The lower-class, grade-school educated men never regarded pre-marital sexual relations as a moral issue, never thought of articulating romantic feelings to their spouses whether linked by shotgun or otherwise, got out to the saloon and firehouse and sometimes other women as fast as possible in early married years; and yet, by the mid-thirties, had become monogamous and, however inarticulately, completely faithful to their spouses. In contrast, the college-educated men, who had poured the entire romantic cornucopia into the early years of marriage, began, also in the

mid-thirties, to take note of pretty women around them and on occasion acted on their perceptions. This was not because our thirty-ish A. B. had a poor sex life at home. Earlier, he had been excited not only by sexual relations with his wife but also giving the baby the two A. M. feeding and then boasting about it at the office. Now, in the thirties, his job is probably fairly secure; he has some equity and one, or maybe two, cars; his children are all in school. What he is likely to feel the loss of, subcutaneously, is the romantic excitement. His wife probably feels the equivalent of this, even though their respective attempts at compensation may be different.

It is precisely at this age period of, roughly, the mid-thirties that we find the statistics highest for divorces and other evidences of marital unrest, for the incidence of true alcoholism, and even for the onset of many physical illnesses with a psychic component. It is, I think, no accident that this peak period coincides with a kind of "disillusionment" about the romantic family pattern. And this may be true whether the pattern has, in this marriage, "worked" or not. If it has "worked," then it is at the price of some psychic dishonesty or concealment. If it has in part not worked, then we are closer to the truth but the emotional reaction is very likely "disillusionment" with bitterness.

The romantic pattern begins between husband and wife, but it extends to parents and children. And in many respects its influence on children begins at an earlier date. In the previous century, a father might articulate little or nothing about his hopes for his son, but nothing could please him more than

a decision on his son's part to become, like father, a lawyer, farmer, minister, physician, or what not. In our present cultural pattern, a father would be "old hat" either to influence such a filial decision or to rejoice openly at it. And a son today, at least to his peers, must apologize if he plans to go into the same occupation as his father. Today it is very much as if a father said to his son, "Look, son, it doesn't really matter what you do—so long as you like it and so long as you are successful at it." Such a pressure, and it is a pressure, upon the children may be far harder to deal with, intrapsychically, than the older type. With the older kind, there was still the possibility of needed detachment; if need be, you could either, finally, conform or rebel. With the present pattern, both conformity and rebellion are barred. You must be successful, which is hard enough; but you must also prove that you like it, which is harder. This point can be taken clear back to music lessons, Cub Scouts, school grades, and above all, to "socializing with his peers." If you think I am exaggerating, talk with the director of any nursery school conducted for the children of upper-middle class parents. Or for lower-middle class parents who are not going to remain "lower" any longer than necessary.

To review, we have, then, the structural assumption about the family: a family is father-mother-children-and-nobody-else. We have the qualitative assumption about the desirable family, which is summed up in the notion of "romantic pattern," which shows great historical gains but cryptically self-defeating losses as well. I do not believe we can select out, discretely, the items we like, and simply discard those we

do not. The pattern, both good and bad dimensions of it, is an organic one. It hangs together. If we want young men to have the kind of life-insurance-oriented-starry-eyedness about their brides that we now seem to advocate, we must accept as an organic component the likelihood of wiggle-watching in the thirties. If we want "Mrs." to be a title even preferred by female college presidents, we must accept as organically linked up that we shall persuade very few women to become physicians or scientists. We can not, I think, have our romantic cake and eat it too.

This is not to say that the positive aspects of the romantic pattern can not be accentuated while the negative ones are guarded against. I do believe that is possible. But not without a kind of reflective analysis, above all on the part of us ministers, that seems all too infrequent these days. And there can not possibly be true reflective analysis that does not emerge in such activities, e.g., as Mother's Day sermons, pre-marital counseling, programs for teen-agers, considering seriously the "kairos" as well as the individual problem when dealing with an alcoholic in his thirties, and much else.

There is not time here to spell out what seems to me the fundamental Christian corrective of the negative side of the "romantic" conception of the family. Biblically, it lies in the general sacramental notion of God's carrying out, beyond our understanding and with an element of mystery, his purpose through human and even material means. For the essence of the "bad" side of romanticism is its ultimate trust in subjective feeling, which is another way of closing oneself equally to the

God-created "depth" of the other and the criticism of one's own "feelings." Subjective feeling is not to be extirpated. It is, rather, to be brought under the criticism of a creative intent that transcends it. Since we are *human* beings, we do not just "endure" mystery. We may also appraise it as "on our side." As Christians, that is precisely what we ought to do. But such an attitude, while fully respecting subjective feeling, can no longer be dominated by its vagaries as if there were nothing else in the situation. Even that which is most precious to us may be such for reasons that transcend our immediate feelings about it. Unless we so appraise in good times, we are unlikely to do so in bad.

The Family Captivated by Christian Faith

It is now time to return to the original question: *What would the suburbs look like if they were captured by Christian faith?* Or, to put it in the oblique terms of this discussion, what would the suburban family look like if it were genuinely captured by Christian faith?

To begin with an effort to answer this question, I believe we should have some real family solidarity if the suburban family were captured by Christian faith. Radical and liberal and person-centered as Christian faith is, I believe it would contribute to all the positive and voluntary-commitment meanings of solidarity in the family, even including a bit of law as well as gospel for those too young or idiosyncratic to deal with gospel unaided. But the striking result would be that solidarity would actually relate to interior integrative social feelings, or, to change the meta-

phor, would be centripetal in essence. It would not primarily define integrated solidarity by what is excluded. It would not be solidarity because father-mother-children are, if need be, against everybody else including Grandma and Sister. It would, instead, be solidarity precisely because, as might be appropriate, Grandma or Sister could be added, *intimately*, and the addition would increase solidarity. This is a hard counsel. Our whole culture goes against it. To take in Grandma, if the poor thing needs it, and anyhow she can baby sit—the culture, happily, is humane enough to encourage that. But to change the lines of who really belongs; aye, there's the rub. A proper Christian faith, extended into life, would stop congratulating its holders about their altruism, filial devotion, democratic humanitarianism, and the like; and would deal with Grandma, with all her individualities, as belonging, being, at the same time, utterly realistic even in a political sense about the idiosyncrasies. Or, to use an insight from Reinhold Niebuhr that he has steadfastly refused to apply to family life, where it is also relevant, quite a lot of family life ought to be political and to be temporarily content with justice as the best, right now, road to love.

But if Christian faith captured the suburban family, the resulting solidarity would have proper holes in it. As some one has said, every family exists in order to make itself unnecessary. The goal of family nurture of children is to make them independent of this particular family constellation, and to help them on to their new family pattern. The breaking of primal ties is indispensable to the proper functions of the family as rearing agency. And if

this is so over-ridingly necessary with children, basically a de-emotionalizing of dependency and a proper boost to autonomy, ought the relationships, in Christian perspective, to be wholly different with the remaining members of the family, namely, husband and wife? If there is not a new kind and level of marital relationship, may not solidarity become principally nostalgic, e.g., "She is the mother of my children"? We are barely beginning to explore such implications.

As a second point, if Christian faith were to capture the suburban family, how would symbols and entities change in their relationship to each other? An automobile, for instance, is both an entity, as a means of transportation, and a symbol of many kinds of things: virility, prosperity, self-respect, conventionality, progressiveness, and much else. Suppose that you were scholarship officer of Princeton Theological Seminary. How would you deal with students' cars? Or, in the context of the present discussion, how would you hope to deal with students' cars if all the students came from suburban homes that had been "captivated" by Christian faith? On behalf of the current scholarship officer of the Seminary, let me give only this answer to the question: any attempt to apply Christian criteria breaks down. Hard business sense, combined with a shared distaste for buses, is about all that can now be used as criterion. But the business sense must include a patterned suspicion about symbolism, that the married student without a car would be suspected, above all by his wife, of being virtually castrated if he did not own a car. My own view of the Christian position is a bit different from that of Seminary

wives; but then, Princeton Seminary does not represent Christian faith in the suburbs! Especially due to the wives.

How would education look if there were Christian captivation of the suburbs? We can be sure that there would be more education, for education at root is the development of potentiality. But it is my hunch that education would become more relevant both for the individual person and for the needs of society. The current discrepancy between the upper-middle class mores—give the child the prestige education even if it almost kills him—and the lower class mores—encouraging general schooling up to a point but then thinking of education strictly as treading water until economic independence is achieved—might very well be questioned in both directions. The unhappy fact at this point is that the leadership on this issue of truly individualizing and socializing education at the same time, which ought properly to be led by the most intelligent of parents, is quite unlikely to be exercised (except in our thoroughly Christian captivation of the suburbs) because the genes of these parents, which they did not create, probably sent their children to Ivy League schools. Indeed, there are some creative authors of important books about the suburban captivity of the churches who seem a bit inarticulate about genes where their own children are concerned. The Christian doctrine of grace, without pride, might help them in our hypothetical state of the Christian captivation of the suburbs.

Again, if the suburban family were captured by Christian faith, how much time would they spend together, and what would they do with that time?

How would their socializing with one another appear? Of one thing I am sure: it is not necessarily true that the more a family gets together the happier it will be, even if it is Christian. Most ministers today carry a vague sense of guilt about how little time they spend with their families. Perhaps the proper question, for a Christian minister with a few dregs of Christian faith, would be: how much more time could your family tolerate? I find myself always suspicious about the "family councils" that are alleged to operate democratically, about the family solidarity gained through television or billiards in the basement or family dedication to weed eradication in the garden. Perhaps this is because my own childhood, although happily free of television, was very high on weed eradication. Even today, I can't see any benefits to my moral character from all those weeds I pulled up. To be sure, there was a gain. My father took pride in a weedless garden. With all my distaste for weeds, I think he took me in on this. Perhaps he was right. But, even today, I prefer weed killer to weed pulling. What is the Christian attitude toward weeds, including child-weed-pullers? I leave the question.

What would a Christian family, suitably captured and suburban, do about television? You may try the "scarcity theory" as we did for a year or so; and of course the children simply kited out to the neighbors'. Or you may, by contrast, try the "satiation theory," with a set in every room. Either way, there is probably an upset in every psyche. What has astonished me about the actual development of television is its confounding of our ecclesiastical predictions of the 1940's. Then, we were all

sure TV was an instrument of the saloon. Since ordinary families could not afford it, everybody including children would be lured into places of otherwise ill-repute to watch it. We failed to note technological progress, that within less than a score of years TV sets would out-number bathrooms. As an instrument of physical geographical cohesion, TV has become tops; you can even see movies at home. Is television, then, an instrument of the Christian captivation of the suburbs? It *does* prevent a lot of "going out." For answer, take your choice, and consider *what* you may see on TV. But the fact remains that every conscientious Christian analysis of the 1940's has been proved wrong.

Next, if the suburban family were captured by Christian faith, what would happen to privacy? Would every child have his own room? Or bathroom? Or would bathrooms be shared? If bathrooms ideally are unshared, what about living rooms and rumpus rooms and even dining rooms and kitchens? Should your son have his own refrigerator and stove? His own bicycle shed? Or, in our new age, his "scooter shed"? Should he have to "share" his toys in the "public rooms"? Or should his trains and 'planes and dolls be accessible to him in a privacy that knows no intruders except an occasional and unobtrusive vacuum cleaner while he is at school? From the point of view of Christian faith, *what* is appropriate privacy? Do we socialize, as at a church dinner, at the top end only? Is there any *Christian* position about such matters?

I heard Margaret Mead tell about a re-visit she had made in the fifties to one of the South Seas communities

she had first studied in the twenties. Since there were no hotels, she was booked to live with a family she had known a generation before. When she arrived, she found, in that benign climate where no protective walls were needed for warmth, and the houses were roofs and floors only, that her own room had been walled off from the remainder of the house—but not from the outside passer-by. When she inquired, she was told, “From whom does one need to be protected except from those with whom he is intimate?” Would privacy, in a Christian-captured suburb, be as open as this to the “others” of the outside world, and as realistic about protection from “insiders”?

Think of all the tests children have to take these days. To what extent are these tests a violation of privacy? Is Educational Testing Service a principal cultural instrument for violating privacy? And in the forthcoming age of computer testing, will his tests, i.e., his private abilities or predilections or antipathies, be still more forced to public view, against his privacy? Who has a right to know all these things about himself that even he can only adumbrate? Should the “state” know things about him that he hardly knows himself, even if it deals responsibly with its knowledge? What is the *Christian* view about intellectual privacy? And if we don’t have some view, heaven help us; for reason is not enough.

If the Christian family in the suburbs had really been captured by Christian faith, how would it look on open occupancy, the right to live here regardless of race, creed, or color, so long only as one had the mortgages to back up the purchase? The answer to this one seems

clear-cut. But what about zoning? You may be justified, even as a Christian, in not wanting a saloon next door, or a smoke-filled factory in the next block. But what about a school across the street, or a playground? Can a grocery store on your street be opposed mainly because you have plenty of cars to drive to the super-market? Precisely *what* is it that zoning is protecting? In addition to profits or privacy, are there cryptic agenda in a particular zoning program? What would Christian faith say about all this?

What would our hypothetical Christian-faith-based family do about community organizations and activities? Would it simply do “more”? Or would it alter its motivations for being responsible about one thing or another? If it organized itself better in order to do this and that in the community, would the children suffer? If, owing to organizing fumblings, it never could find time to get away from the children, would it be a community failure but a family success? How much organization does Christian faith enjoin or tolerate?

What would our hypothetical Christian-faith-captured family do about considering issues? The family council sounds like a great idea, and I admire the families who claim to be dealing with their issues in that way. Like the New England town meeting, the actual situation may be a bit less democratic than it appears on the surface. Even in the family, there may be cryptic ways of dealing with the persistent non-conformist. The real test comes, whatever the family has tried before, when the particular family, at this juncture, approaches defeat, whether generally or of a member. Would the real Christian family muddle through or, admitting

temporary defeat, swallow its pride and get the best available help? I hope it would do the latter, whether psychiatrists, architects, special schools, ministers, or anything else were involved. But, in order to move in that way, any family today must counter the general cultural pattern: You are a good family if you can solve your problems without outside help. In my judgment, the family in the suburbs with true Christian faith would make no distinction between "inside" and "outside" help to either itself or its individual members, so long only as the help were relevant to the issue. Strength would lie in the relevance of help and the courage to request or use it, not in the negation of need for it.

The Intentionality of the Suburb

Sometimes, in psychological thought, we want to show that there is some direction even if not obtrusive or obvious; but on the other hand, that this direction is not fore-ordained or worthy of a teleological designation. For this "in-between," not necessarily conscious, kind of direction the term "intentionality" has sometimes been used.

No one, consciously, planned the suburbs as such. And yet they did not, like Topsy, just grow. There is a dynamic, energetic motif in the development of even the most megalopolitan suburbs that can not, on the one side, be laid to conscious planning nor, on the other, to mere happenstance. What is, in between, the "intentionality" of the suburbs?

The "intentionality" is, to return to an earlier comment, an attempt to guard against the determination of human living itself by the smoke and noise and congestion of the background pro-

cesses necessary for the goods upon which human living rests. It is, in other words, an effort to prevent the means from wholly determining the ends. If you have to work with smoke, do you have to live with it? Or, as in one of my college summers, if you have to work with smells, do you have to take them "home" with you? The minute one defines the place where, with family, he is relatively devoid of smells, of smoke, of congestion, and of lack of privacy—there one has a definition of the "intentionality" of the suburb. Until modern transportation made it possible, this kind of separation would not have been an option. But, with modern transportation, the intentionality—which must have existed in ancient Athens or Jerusalem too, can take different forms. The suburb is not "getting away from it all," for one must be back next morning at 8:30. The suburb becomes possible when transportation *enables* you to get back at 8:30.

I have been doing some analogical thinking about the suburbs in relation to mental illness and mental health. We now believe that even the patient in the most removed back ward of the mental hospital has strengths, as well as the obvious weaknesses, that far transcend his own fondest hopes. He developed his pattern, that has eventually led to his illness, not by being weak but by being strong enough to create a "coping device," probably in early years, that defended him against worse possibilities. If he became withdrawn, it was, originally, to protect him from not being noticed or appreciated. If he got excited or enthusiastic, it was to protect and defend him from evaluations that would reduce everything, including him, to mediocrity. If he became depressed,

it was to prevent his anger from reaching out, with ill consequences to him, against those who had provoked his probably justified antipathy. In other words, the roots, so far as we now know, of mental illness lie not in general weakness but in the psychic strength, within limited resources, to defend against or cope with actually existing threats in early life. Like the rock to which the nearly-drowned swimmer clings, these coping devices, having once saved, tend to become normative for the person even after their saving usefulness is past.

The suburbs, I think, are properly to be seen as "coping devices" very much in the same sense as mental illnesses. If any proper planner had been in charge, he would have created any suburb, no matter what, differently from what it is today, even Winnetka or Bronxville or Princeton. But the "intentionality" of the suburbs has operated mostly without such conscious planning, precisely as we find the character patterns of the individual person, when also under threat, have operated in early life to affect very deeply his character in later life. If one could say, in relation to later life, either: "It's all right" or "It's all wrong," there would be an economy of mental effort. But to say either would be false both to the theory of mental illness and, if my analogy has meaning, to the theory of suburbia. Like the person warding off worse potentialities who later becomes mentally ill, the suburbs today are the unintended result of previous positive coping with things that, if not coped with at all, could have been a lot worse. As in mental illness, the "vitalities" are partly concealed beneath the "pathologies." But the vitalities are there! Articulated or not, they

may be assumed, if there is any base at all to our analogy. The suburbs had a good defensive idea. They saved us from worse. But they hung on to the notion regardless. In the new situation, the notion they hung on to was, at best, ambiguous. Consequently, the suburbs themselves are ambiguous. They may even, in many respects, be analogous to illness or pathology. But beneath all that there is strength. Life does *not*, in its human sense, have to be determined wholly by smoke and refuse and waste products. Life can be transcendent of those things, even if, at some point and in some way, smoke and refuse and waste products are necessary.

It may seem strange to you that, once I had begun to think of suburbia as analogous to mental illness, I began to appreciate its potentialities; but that is true. Nobody designs or plans mental illness. But mental illness is the unintended result of "coping," against threat, that means vitality and strength, granted all the circumstances, and not weakness or capitulation. The consequences, all unintended, are mental illness. They are rough and tough and painful and baffling, even to those who try to help. But it makes an enormous difference whether they are seen as simple weakness (which they are not) or as misdirected potential strength (which they are).

So it is with the suburbs. In my judgment, they are, with all their issues and problems and boo-boos, instances of misdirected strength. As they are now, they crush people, and not just poor people, much more expeditiously than either the farm or the city could do. But that is a by-product, a painful one, and a reprehensible one, just as is mental illness. That fact should not prevent

us from seeing their general "intentionality," which is quite in the other direction.

Like the mentally ill patient, in my judgment the future of the suburbs will rest upon the capacity of the patient (in this analogy, the community) to understand its development as a "coping device," inspired but fated, relevant but dated, competent but theoretically deficient, to deal with genuine threat, and extending into the new era a temptation to cling to saving rocks and slogans and ordinances all out of proportion to the reality situation. The *thrust* is right in exactly the same sense as is the thrust of the mental patient's thrust into illness. But such defensive thrusts are not enough. Something else has to interpret the "intentionality," and respect it while altering the method. It is precisely that, I think, with which the suburbs are confronted.

Conclusion

By analogy, I have suggested that the suburbs are a sick patient who has no notion of his potential strengths but who can be saved only if he acknowledges and uses them.

Suppose there had been no suburban development, that all human beings, including families, had simply remained under the shadow of smoke-stacks and the smell of industrial production. That would have been a worse fate than we now have. Family living, with all its previously analyzed ambiguities, would have been much leaner and more restricted. The actual trend, whatever its deficiencies, has been in the direction of richness, albeit a problem richness. But the trend itself is correct. Get out of

the smoke and smells. Let human living be as human as possible.

I hope profoundly that ministers in suburban areas will quit apologizing for their being there, and quit alike inwardly feeling that the suburbs are Satan's unique abode. The suburbs are, in the judgment of this discussion, the unintended consequences (partly pro and partly con) of an effort which, if it had *not* been made, would have landed us all in a more pathological pickle than we currently confront. Thus, the suburbs are evidences of "life," of "positive directionality" or of "constructive intentionality."

Can the suburbs make it? Think of a psychiatrist who shares my understanding of mental illness, and who confronts a new patient. Can the patient, with his help, make it? He must, in honesty, declare that he does not know. But he does know that his belief in the positive potential, even in the form of the patient's illness itself, is a pro or plus factor to helping him. So it is, I think, with the suburbs. The minister in suburbia who thinks that "all's right with the world" will not do. Nor will he who takes every negative sign at face value. But he who sees that, even in suburbia, strength may be weakness and weakness may be strength, may in truth be something a good deal more important than the blind leading the blind. In my judgment, our civilization for years to come will rest upon our understanding of the suburbs, family, ambiguity, and all. And ministry rests upon understanding. Let us, brethren, do our best to make it. In my judgment, not all our rowing is upstream.

ISSUES IN CHURCH EDUCATION TODAY

D. CAMPBELL WYCKOFF

FROM time to time in the course of any human enterprise there arise situations which, though emerging from specific and limited circumstances, ramify so as to force redirection of the total enterprise. Recent developments in religion and the public schools give promise of producing such effects, both in public school education and in church education. At the moment it is impossible to predict these effects with any certainty, but it is nevertheless high time to look at the issues involved.

As is more clearly recognized now than before, the questions raised by the school and religion problem go far deeper than legal formalities or administrative arrangements. They require, in fact, a clarification of what we mean by education and the responsibilities that the church is to bear for education. This is proving to be a welcome development, especially in that it is suggesting that the arrangements we have taken for granted in church and public education may be mere expedients of a pluralistic society, and not too defensible from either educational or religious points of view.

This paper is to look at the problem from the point of view of church education. However, even an understanding of the term "church education" sufficient to provide for its meaningful use brings up the more fundamental questions of types of education and their interrelationships. Let us look first at the meaning of education, certain types of education, and key educational functions, and then turn to

questions specifically implied in church education.

Education may be given either broad or restricted definitions. Restricted definitions emphasize the formal aspects of education as schooling, while broad definitions see education as encompassing all the formal and informal dynamics of nurture. Recent studies in the history of education have tended toward the broader definitions (with consequent reconstruction of the discipline of history of education), while studies in teaching-learning (including reinforcement theories of learning, technical developments in programmed learning, and structure of knowledge theories of curriculum) have used more restricted definitions.

The concepts "curriculum" and "method" share in these broad and restricted definitions. Broadly, curriculum is thought of as the overall program of an educational institution; method in this case is thought of as those specific activities that implement the program, a rather restricted concept. Method, however, may be given a broad definition, and be seen as those ways of God, man, society, and nature by which they influence and change one another; a restricted concept of curriculum would follow, making it that limited enterprise consisting in the planned and institutionalized use of method.

Often education is "typed" according to its functions. Liberal education functions toward the life of wisdom; technical education, toward the useful life; moral education, toward the good life;

religious education, toward the life of commitment; and Christian education, toward the redeemed life of discipleship. In our society, these types of educational functions have been somewhat segregated, primary responsibility for each being assigned to a different institution (with the exception of religious education, which is something of an institutional orphan). Much current educational debate and discussion is rooted in this situation, each institution trying to define and limit its responsibility and at the same time chafing at its fragmentariness. We may, in fact, be on the verge of a major rearrangement of institutional functions in education, due to prohibition of worship and education for sectarian commitment in the public schools coupled with encouragement to the public schools to teach seriously about religion in a cultural context.

To indicate my own position on these basic matters of definition, I incline toward a broad definition of education as encompassing all the formal and informal dynamics of nurture, which allows for the use of restricted concepts in more discrete and less imperialistic ways. My choice also is for a broad concept of method as those ways of God, man, society, and nature by which they influence and change one another. I couple with this a more restricted definition of curriculum as those aspects of education that are responsibly planned and that utilize method in consciously formal ways. I do not see any feasible alternative to institutional assignment of responsibility for the various types and functions of education, but I believe that part of the task of curriculum workers in all educational institutions is coordination of their

work at the conceptual level so that all types and functions of education are encompassed within one overall curriculum design.

In view of these definitions and concepts, the idea of "church education" is of only limited and specific value. Its value is merely in helping to designate a part of the educational task to a particular institution. Fallaw used the term to castigate the institution for not taking its educational responsibilities seriously enough, and to challenge it to do so (in *Church Education for Tomorrow*, 1960). The term is used in this paper merely as a convenience for referring to a cluster of educational responsibilities which the church as an institution happens currently to bear.

In looking at issues in church education today, it is well to bear in mind the forces and movements of the past with which Christian educators have grappled and that have shaped and molded the present situation. To mention the most important: the Sunday School movement; the evangelical revivals; the missionary movement; ferment and change in educational theory and practice; the theological renaissance; the ecumenical movement. These forces and movements themselves have reflected and responded to larger forces and movements of social, cultural, and technological change. It is important to remember that the enterprise of church education has never had a plan or strategy for meeting change, and that it presently contains undigested elements of all these forces and movements.

Most recently, attention has centered upon the problems of objectives and curriculum design for Christian education. Theological and ecclesiastical pres-

sures were the occasion for curriculum studies and innovations on the part of several denominations unilaterally (Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, and United Church). Interdenominational studies of objectives and curriculum design followed, and are now coming to fruition. The new curriculum products are significant, and reflect to varying degrees the process of co-operative study and planning; but more significant are the theoretical and technical agreements that now undergird the major curriculum processes of American Protestantism, agreements on the objective, scope, context, process, personnel, and timing of Christian education and upon the design of the curriculum. Much still remains to be done in clarifying, developing, and communicating these concepts and their implications, but this involves no major issues.

Upon the background of the forces and movements of the past, both distant and immediate, it is possible to look more discriminately at emergent issues in church education today. These are difficult to identify, of course, but I have chosen them in terms of what seems to be bothering and challenging me and my fellow Christian educators at the present time. They are in two clusters, the first more or less theoretical, the second more or less practical. In the more theoretical cluster of issues I have identified several points of reference: secularity, the new ecumenism, vocation, knowledge, and reality.

The term "secularity" is used significantly in current discussion to suggest that God is working through structures and processes other than the church and organized religion. Most especially is he active in the social, po-

litical, intellectual, and artistic movements and changes in the world around. By contrast, he seems to ignore the church, which is complacent in its own affairs and in its own past, an eddy in the modern world rather than part of the mainstream. The attempt here is to call attention to the importance of tension and change in the world, to evaluate the church's usefulness realistically, and to move Christians toward presence and activity in the world and away from pietistic irrelevance and inactivity. (It may not be long before Coe's *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, 1917, is rediscovered and re-evaluated.)

By "the new ecumenism" is meant a catholicity that concerns itself with knowledge and re-evaluation not only of relationships among Christian bodies, but also the crossing of faith lines on a world scale. A commonality of Christian experience and concern is now being realized among Protestant groups, and with the Roman and Orthodox branches of the church. At many points, especially education and social action, Jewish groups are involved in this developing commonality. Encounter with Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism in particular is moving from an academically isolated interest into a major world force and carrying with it a growing sense of the significance of the universals of religious experience. Fortunately the phenomenologists of religion (Wach, van der Leeuw, Eliade, Altizer, and others) and other behavioral scientists conducting investigations in the field of religion have prepared a firm scholarly base for exploration and discovery. There is thus a widespread new appreciation of

... the catholic man who hath mightily won / God out of knowledge and good out of infinite pain . . .

The emphasis upon "vocation" redefines the objective of the church as mission and ministry, sees that mission and ministry as the responsibility of entire people of God (*laos* as opposed to specialized clergy), and urges each member to seek (in co-operation and co-ordination with the whole people) his particular gift and calling as a member of the one Body. Plausible and convincing, this position still raises real questions of objective and method for Christian education. So far as the objective is concerned, the problem often polarizes in terms of self-realization *vs.* social responsibility. So far as method is concerned the polarization might be emphasis on structured knowledge (or, as an alternative, creativity) *vs.* functional apprenticeship. In the heyday of religious education, W. W. Charters insisted upon a job analysis orientation for curriculum theory and design, guided by an intricately worked out system of specific objectives that spelled out the job to be done, the steps toward becoming the person and gaining the skills and knowledges to do the job, and the activities required for achieving such objectives. At the same time, William Clayton Bower was equally insistent that there was to be no predetermined structure of objectives in the curriculum, but rather the fostering of a creative spirit in which each person and group would tend to determine an appropriate sequence of objectives and educational activities. Thus the emphasis upon vocation in contemporary church life has created

a possible polarization of educational functions like that that plagues higher education in terms of the liberal education *vs.* professional education issue.

The problem so far as "knowledge" is concerned is that of what is to be taught and learned and how it may best be organized and communicated. Just at a time when this question is being rather satisfactorily dealt with in secular education (at the instigation of such theorists as Jerome Bruner), the "structure of knowledge" problem in Christian education has become more acute than ever. To what structure of knowledge does the Christian educator repair? Every theologian does his work in his own idiosyncratic way, so that it is difficult for serious theologians to understand one another without exhausting preliminary considerations of methodology, in which they may eventually come to understand, but certainly not to agree with, one another. Chief among the difficulties for theology has been a widespread refusal to face the epistemological problem. That problem has been relegated to philosophy, and a sharp line of distinction drawn between theology and philosophy in terms of both task and intellectual orientation. The epistemological problem is only now being raised again in theological circles, a situation that makes one pessimistic about any early agreement as to the structure of theological knowledge. Of course, one theologian (say, Tillich) could be chosen and his system used, but this would hardly do for church education on any broad scale.

The same problem plagues the field of biblical studies. The hermeneutical basis for the biblical disciplines is quite undecided (is, in fact, the most widely discussed question of the day in biblical

and theological circles). The question is so fraught with emotion in the church at large, that Christian educators have usually avoided the issue or run for cover when it approached. For a time it appeared that a feasible solution was presented by the biblical theological position worked out on the basis of a generally Barthian position (by which the unity of the Bible was stressed, and one could sound conservative while actually working with many of the tools of modern inquiry). But the flaws in biblical theological method are beginning to show, with the result that the question of the structure of biblical knowledge is again thrown wide open.

The historical disciplines are in much the same situation. J. H. Nichols has recently pointed out the obsolescence of the major works in this field, and Jaroslav Pelikan has in effect called for a moratorium on further attempts at systematics until a generation of scholars in historical theology have replenished the reservoirs of thought. The situation here is not so much lack of structure in knowledge as the use of outmoded structures of knowledge and lack of conviction on the part of historians with regard to these structures of knowledge.

With the unsettled state of the theological, biblical, and historical fields, one would expect little of the practical field. Practical theology is, after all, a derivative discipline, doing its work in light of the methods and findings of the other theological (and related philosophical and behavioral) disciplines. Yet practical theology has been working hard at its structure of knowledge, seeing its orientation as the living church at work, and thus developing a functional approach. The result, how-

ever, is practical knowledge in functional categories, hardly of a character to please the academic disciplinarians who are promoting the structure of knowledge idea as an organizing principle for education.

The issue of "reality" refers to the question of ontology, now under severe scrutiny by both existentialists and language analysts. The existentialist views of reality run all the way from Tillich's "ultimate" through Heidegger's phenomenological approach to "being" to an almost pure subjectivism. The language analysts raise the question of the meaning or "prediction value" of the terms that traditional philosophy uses to denote metaphysical reality. These philosophically oriented views have their counterparts in the fields of theology and philosophy of religion, running from the impressionism of Gabriel Vahanian and the skepticism of Paul Van Buren to the constructive analysis of John Hick. At the moment there seems little possibility of anything but the most critical discussion of the issue for the next generation.

Granted that these points of reference are vague, one may still hazard some guesses as to implications for the church and for Christian education. It seems clear that movements of thought that will influence church education in the future are gathering and doing their work largely outside the church itself. The action-orientation and thought-orientation of modern man, including modern man within the church is outside the church. The strategy of the church, in light of this fact, may well be to give its primary attention to what is happening outside itself, and in light of these movements to raise again the double question of its integrity and its

mission. The strategy for church education may well be to pay close heed to the ways in which educational theory attempts to cope with these same forces, and to utilize this experience, together with new insights into the church's character and mission, in reshaping theory and practice.

In the process, religious education may come back into its own, not as a substitute for Christian education, but as a discipline that is built in terms of an examined process of valuing and personal and corporate commitment to values. As Ward Madden showed (in *Religious Values in Education*, 1951), religious experience as discrimination of and commitment to value is the culmination of the educational process, without which education itself cannot come to fulfillment. At the same time, there may be some merit in examining Christian education as a special case of religious education. This might prove to be the clue to re-establishing a lost continuity between education and Christian education, and might thus provide a basis for more than superficial discussion between public and private educators and educational representatives of the various faith groups in America.

Clearly, one of the key issues is that of knowledge. Theology is just in process of interesting itself again in the question, and before it is through will probably have to conduct a number of experiments in theological methodology in various centers from those of high scholarship to the parish. Such experiments might center in such questions as the relation of faith to ethics and religious experience to social action, and such questions as the relation of worship to theology and prayer to

decision-making. Such experiments cannot help but prove to be enlightening to church educators who are even now pondering the relation of ethics and education and the relation of worship and action.

Theological knowledge need not wait for complete internal clarification before it is brought to bear upon other structures of knowledge. Let it simply face again the epistemological problem frankly and openly, and other structures of knowledge (the humanities and the sciences) will be found to be at least somewhat open to discussion. Christian educators have been saying that the scope of Christian teaching and learning is "the whole field of relationships in the light of the gospel." In the terms being used here this might well mean at least the humanities and the sciences in the light of theology.

New concepts of theology's own structure of knowledge might begin to emerge from such discussion, but there is little possibility of this happening unless theology is willing to come out from behind its non-epistemological barricades. The fact that it is now beginning to do so, however embarrassing and disconcerting to church thought, is encouraging. If new concepts of theology's structure of knowledge (including, of course, its major branches) began to emerge with any kind of consensus, then church education might be in a position to begin to re-think curriculum in light of the structures of knowledge idea. Until that time, methods of involvement, apprenticeship, and socialization will have to do, with such reliance upon traditional structures of theological, biblical, and historical knowledge as is warranted, and with such experimentation in the theological,

biblical, and historical fields as may be engaged in for educational purposes.

Methods of involvement, apprenticeship, and socialization may be the heart of the matter so far as training for the ministry of the laity is concerned. Those who hoped for a great surge of serious interest in theology on the part of the laity have been disappointed (which may be as much a commentary on the state of theology as it is on the concerns of the laity). But those who saw the laity becoming more and more involved in Christ's mission in the world, and learning the meaning of Christian faith and responsibility while thus engaged, may well be somewhat encouraged by recent trends.

The clarification of theological structures of knowledge, coupled with deepened and enriched experience in the meaning of Christian social responsibility and its sources in the life of worship, may provide a basis for a new step ahead in the development of Christian education theory. Christian education knows its categories of theory, its basic practical questions (objective, method, curriculum, and administration), and it knows how to use the disciplinary sources from which its substance is derived. But the adequacy and validity of the principles that make up Christian education theory depend upon the adequacy and validity of the disciplines and the practical experience available to it.

The second cluster of issues tends towards the more practical side. Here we examine the questions of levels of responsibility and planning, the locus of education, and initiative. These questions by no means exhaust the practical issues, but may perhaps serve to focus them.

In the past, responsibility for Christian education operation has been placed squarely at the parish level, while responsibility for planning has been located in national denominational (and to some extent interdenominational) bodies. This is bound to change. Let me overstate the case by saying that there is nothing viable in the contemporary world about the local denominational parish or the national denominational church, and that because of this the levels of responsibility for planning and operation are going to have to shift from the parish to the community and from the national denomination to ecumenical bodies.

Having overstated the case, let me try to estimate the realities and possibilities of the situation accurately. Parishes do serve the legitimate purpose of acting as gathering places and organizational foci for Christian worship, fellowship, work, and education. There is urgent need for paraparochial experimentation in new forms of church life, but these, however successful and functional, may hardly be expected to replace the parish structure of the church as we know it. The thing that makes nonsense of the parish today is its denominational character, especially when it is recognized that any given parish consists of a hodge-podge of persons of various denominational backgrounds commonly holding rather extremely varied views on theological and other matters. Yet educational planning among churches in a community is ordinarily at a minimum, the effective planning being done by given parishes with other parishes of their particular denominational brand in other localities. Thus local situations and needs are largely ignored, no overall strategy for

Christian education throughout the community develops, and the church flows peacefully again into its little eddy.

This situation needs to be corrected by developing an ecumenical educational strategy and operational plan at the local level, involving parish education and other para-parochial types of education. Something of this sort may be fostered by the new federal educational plans, if the church is able to lift its eyes beyond the parish and to focus beyond the denomination. One practical result might be community high schools for Christian education, staffed by professionally trained people, and challenging high school youth at a high intellectual and practical level, replacing the disreputable and sagging "high school departments" that now manage somehow to survive in many of our Sunday church schools.

Much the same argument may be used in discussing denominational educational planning. Let me repeat a suggestion that I made at the curriculum consultation of the World Council of Christian Education and Sunday School Association, in Furigen, Switzerland, in June 1964:

Insofar as the church's experience is genuinely lived and guided at the denominational level, curriculum planning and decision-making would remain there. Yet I believe that less and less that is really telling happens at that level. The real life of the church is lived at the local and ecumenical levels. To organize the curriculum in terms of the church's experience at the local level is to create the educational plan locally. To organize the curriculum in terms of the

church's experience at the ecumenical level is to see that all Christian education everywhere is genuinely sensitive and responsive to the universals of the faith and their inescapably world-wide implications. Let the organization of basic imperatives and thrusts be accomplished at the ecumenical level; let the specific educational plan be organized at the local level; let the denomination (or some more functional mode of decentralization) act as an agency for producing resource materials that will enable the local level to be ecumenical in character and for providing the supervisory services that will make local planning practicable and effective.

The locus of education is difficult to determine, and becomes an issue because of this difficulty. When they fail to face this question squarely, Christian educators often sound as though they were suggesting that the locus of education was in the individual in isolation, or that it was in the educating society. Actually, there are many "centers" of education: the individual, the family, the school, the peer group, the community, the culture, the nation, the church, the denomination. Viewed from one perspective or another, various ones of these become more or less important. They may best be viewed, perhaps, as open systems interacting, interlocking, and interweaving in the educational process. When thus viewed, other systems (the ecological, the symbolic, etc.) usefully enter the picture. With such a picture, which adequately represents all the forces at work, it may be meaningfully said that education centers upon changes in persons, and that in order to accomplish such changes educators

must take responsibility also for certain changes in the structures and processes of society and culture as they impinge tellingly upon the person being educated.

One reason for stressing the locus of education as the person within a complex of interacting and transacting systems is that church education is developing a tendency at present toward regarding the church as a closed system so far as its educational work is concerned. Should this happen and be taken seriously in planning, not only would the education of the person through the church be severely limited, but significant participation of the church in co-operative planning for the education of the individual would be curtailed.

The issue of initiative arises because Christian education has rather characteristically left the initiative in planning and policy-making in the hands of educators and ecclesiastics. What is now being proposed in this paper is a policy of co-operation and co-ordination in total educational planning that would include the public educator, the private educator, the higher educator, and the church educator. There is no reason why the church educator cannot take the initiative in this matter. In fact, I would guess that if he did not take the initiative he would be left out of the planning, with the result that educational planning for the learner would inevitably be truncated and frustrated. It has been suggested previously that such co-operation and co-ordination in planning would require a continuity that might be defined along an education—religious education—Christian education line, with the character of re-

ligious education providing the bridge. It is to be noted, however, that this does not imply that when the church educator takes the initiative he has to have a complete theory and plan in mind. All he needs, as a matter of fact, is a good question like, "What do you have in mind for the children of this community, and would you like to hear what we have in mind?"

The issues of levels, locus, and initiative, if faced forthrightly, are bound to force all educators (and especially church educators) out of the stereotypes of their present preconceptions, and into exploratory and experimental situations in which they will be meeting with new people, devising and using new structures and processes, and living in a new (but somewhat more complete and articulated) world.

It may be of some use, in finishing this paper, to attempt a brief cross-referencing of church and public school educational concerns, to indicate points at which joint thought and work might be useful or required. This is best done in outline form:

- I. Concern for the discipline of education.
 - A. Definition and use of the methods of philosophy of education.
 - B. Definition and use of the methods of theology in analyzing educational problems and possibilities.
 - C. Definition and use of behavioral and other scientific approaches to understanding and guiding education.
 - D. Determination of the role, categories, and principles of educational theory, religious educational theory, and Christian education theory.

- II. Concern for learning theory and its implications for practice.
 - A. Co-operative investigation of findings in learning theory and research, including: reinforcement theory; the cognitive, structure of knowledge approach; gestalt-field theory, and the concept of learning tasks in education and Christian education; conflict theory.
 - B. Co-operative determination of possible implications and uses of learning theory in education, religious education, and Christian education.
- III. Concern for human development investigations and their educational implications.
 - A. Joint review of such theories as those of Gesell, Havighurst, and Erikson.
 - B. Investigation of the possibility of a theological theory of human development.
- IV. Concern for curriculum theory and design, including establishment of common categories, and assignment of institutional responsibilities.
- V. Concern for educational evaluation. (Note the ready-made basis for such joint investigation and experimentation in the two handbooks of the *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*.)
- VI. Concern for technology and education.
- A. Curricular and administrative aspects of educational technology.
- B. Areas of possible co-operation and co-ordination.

VII. Concern for working out new and creative organizational relationships, with due concern for separation of church and state (which does not necessarily imply separation of religion and education, a functional impossibility), and with due regard for integrity and authenticity of institutional functions.

Recognizing the impossibility of summarizing a paper that is already a summary, the discussion may perhaps be pointed up by stating a principle. The principle falls in the area of curriculum, since that area is the one in which our most fruitful early investigations will undoubtedly occur. The principle is that of "co-ordinated supplementation," and might be stated thus: All those (school, church and home) concerned with the integrity of the education of persons in this country are to regard their particular enterprises as supplementary to each other, and thus subject to such a degree of co-ordinated planning and operation as is consistent with the needs of the persons and the purposes of the institutions involved. The only alternatives to such a principle as this appear to be the continuation of isolated particularity, or either total or partial absorption of functions by one or the other of the institutions involved.

ALBERT JOSEPH MC CARTNEY

1878-1965

Tribute by Edward L. R. Elson

at the Memorial Service in The National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C.

August 24, 1965

ANY knowledgable man's list of great American preachers in the first half of this century would include the name of Albert Joseph McCartney. He was born of Covenanter stock, reared under Covenanter spiritual discipline in the manse of a distinguished Presbyterian minister and educator. Two older brothers, Ernest and Robertson, preceded him into the ministry, and Clarence, the youngest of them, followed Albert, thus comprising the most distinguished quartet of ministers produced by one family in our denomination in many generations. This service today in a very real sense marks the end of an era—for he was the sole survivor of the four. The pulpit in which I stand today was presented to the National Presbyterian Church by the four eminent clergymen brothers as a memorial to their parents.

Boyhood was spent in a home where the religious life was the norm. The family engaged in daily Bible study, family prayers, the singing of psalms and hymns, to which was added regular drill in the shorter Catechism. Each boy memorized vast portions of the most meaningful passages of Scripture. Albert McCartney was so steeped in a knowledge of the Scriptures that he probably knew more English Bible on entering the Theological Seminary than most men do upon graduation. Thus throughout life Albert Joseph drew upon his rich hereditary endowments, the spiritual disciplines inculcated in him from boyhood.

I came to know all four of the McCartney ministers. Ernest, who was the oldest, was a mystic. Robertson, who came next, was the Bible teacher and interpreter. He had the greatest repertoire of anecdotes of any Presbyterian minister. He examined me in Greek exegesis and was one of the Presbyters who laid hands on my head at my ordination. The youngest brother, Clarence, was a superior theologian, a tremendous preacher, orator, historian and author of twenty or thirty books—serving long pastorates in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Albert Joseph McCartney, next to the youngest of the four, was the "John Barrymore of the American pulpit." Educated at Wisconsin, Princeton, Oxford and Glasgow Universities and ordained in 1904, for three or four decades he was in the forefront of American religious life. From the earliest years of his career his sermons appeared in the old *Homiletical Review*, *The Presbyterian Banner*, *The Presbyterian Advance* and *Tribune*, and later they appeared frequently in *The Christian Century Pulpit*.

His first pastorate was undertaken in Western Pennsylvania at a time when the minister not only was furnished a manse but also a horse and carriage for pastoral work. Time here does not permit relating the fascinating tales of the handsome young bachelor minister of those days.

As a sermonizer and preacher he was a master craftsman. He worked hard on everything he ever wrote or spoke. He preached on the great themes. His messages were always rich in content, accurate in scholarship and he drew upon his vast knowledge of ancient and modern literature to illustrate and make vivid his sermons. He possessed a creative imagination and framed his thoughts in the pattern of a poet, clothing his ideas in majestic language that moved men in the depths of their being. He could soar with winged words and carry a congregation with him. He preached a full-orbed gospel, never riding a hobby, never addicted to the passing homiletical fad, but always accenting the Biblical revelation and proclaiming the gospel of redeeming love through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, whom he loved and served with his whole being.

Prematurely gray, with strong masculine features and a striking profile, he was a commanding figure in the pulpit. Endowed with a rich musical voice he used it as an instrument of God—the trumpet of the Lord—proclaiming the eternal richness of truth and grace in Christ Jesus. He wrote every word of every sermon, and although he had the manuscript, he never read it except perhaps to make an accurate quotation. He did not need to read the manuscript for the message had so mastered him long before he entered the pulpit that you knew God was using this human instrument to proclaim his word. It was always the good news of the gospel he uttered—good news for the down-and-outer and good news for the up-and-outer—the saving grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the new life for the penitent one who by faith claimed redemption through Christ.

As a person he was tender, warmhearted, and compassionate. In his presence you felt here was spiritual aristocracy—outgoing, friendly, brotherly with fellow ministers, democratic yet never demeaning or common or cheap—always available in time of need. He worked hard and long. He carefully sorted out the important from the unimportant and gave his time and talents to the great and important matters.

He had respect for the human body which housed his spirit and made a place for physical activity. An avid horseman, he also loved golf and swimming.

Warmhearted, friendly, evangelical as he was, he had a passionate concern for social evils and public morals. He was incisive and emphatic when he proclaimed God's judgment upon the evils of our times. Can anyone who heard or read his sermons of 1928 and 1929, when an easy sex morality was prevalent and the norms of the California beaches were intruding upon the norms of the civic community, not remember as he preached sermons on "What Price Virtue?" and "Modern Sun-Worshippers" which evoked national attention? There was an elegant fierceness in his condemnation of immorality and social injustice. And there was his unforgettable sermon on "The Unknown Soldier Wakes and Walks" given at a time of excessive, unreal, sentimental, pacifism when some men were dissipating the victory of World War I. Or remember his great sermon to all Americans at the time of the Lindbergh kidnapping. Yet with all his orientation to current concerns his central message was always Jesus Christ, his life, his atoning death, his resurrection and abiding presence. To this very day I carry in memory the word picture he portrayed of the frazzled, degenerate, prodigal

son being welcomed to the loving embrace of the Father, which I heard in 1929. He was a great preacher.

He was adept at prayer. He knew when to pray and how to pray and when he prayed it was in the classical language of the spiritual expert.

He loved little children and they loved him. The day following my installation here in 1946 he baptized our youngest daughter and never ceased being interested in her. He was kindly with and solicitous of old folk, patient with those who were slow in faith, tolerant of the worldling and the spiritually immature. Among all ages and classes he was comfortable and lifted them God-ward.

His was one of the great careers in our Church in our time. Following his early Pennsylvania pastorates, he had his longest and very satisfying ministry in the influential Kenwood Evangelical Church of Chicago.

While at the Kenwood Church he met and married the gracious and beautiful Marie who bore him two sons, in whom he took great pride. In 1929 when I first knew Mrs. McCartney, and the two sons were students at Harvard Military Academy, it seemed to me I had never met a more beautiful and refined lady. They were a great pair. And while Mrs. McCartney was a faithful member of the Church, she was first of all the wife of the man Albert and he never permitted her to become a synthetic member of the Church staff—a lesson which ought to be learned by both ministers and congregations.

From Chicago he went to our Church in Santa Monica, California. Less than three years later he was called to the Church of the Covenant in Washington, which pulpit he honored for fifteen significant years. Here he preached the unsearchable riches of Christ. Here he guided the union of the old First Presbyterian Church in the District of Columbia—the parent of all our Churches in the original District of Columbia—with the Church of the Covenant to form the Covenant-First Presbyterian Church and receive from the General Assembly designation as the future National Presbyterian Church. Here throughout the difficult years of depression and war, as chairman of the National Capital Presbyterian Commission he conserved the interest, raised funds and cultivated the instrumentalities of the Church which in later years brought into being the National Presbyterian Church. In the war years there sat before him Sunday after Sunday the highest ranking Presbyterian in our government—Secretary Henry L. Stimson, and a host of others bearing solemn responsibilities. During this period the Church was not only distinguished for its hospitality to thousands of servicemen, and the vitality of its pulpit, but also by the fact its senior Pastor was on duty as a Navy Chaplain. He served on Boards and Agencies of the Church and was especially devoted to Princeton Seminary.

Highly esteemed by his brethren throughout the Church, twice Dr. McCartney was nominated for Moderator of the General Assembly. If he was denied this honor which was accorded his younger brother Clarence before he was forty years of age, Albert nevertheless made one of the greatest contributions to the Presbyterian Church of any man in his generation.

In the General Assembly in Baltimore in 1926 when the Modernist-Fundamentalist conflict was at its height and the Church had been rocked to its depths,

Albert arose and began by addressing the Assembly—"Mr. Moderator, Fathers and brethren, and brother Clarence"—with whom he had differed. Then he went on to say that as he and Clarence had been reared in the same household and prayed at the same mother's knee, so there was a great place for each of them and for all who joined them in the household of faith and the home of the soul, the great mother Church. This moment is said to be the high-water mark of that bitter era and signalized the liquidation of the conflict in our Church.

In the spring of 1929, while I was still a licentiate, he invited me to become his assistant in the Santa Monica Church. I began my work in September and within a week or two he left me with the Church and guest preachers while he went East. The Church of the Covenant in Washington had been vacant since the retirement of Dr. Charles Wood, and Dr. McCartney was now the minister the committee was anxious to confer with. In due time he returned and I met him at the Old Santa Fe Railroad Station in Los Angeles. There was no mistaking this distinguished man as he emerged from the train with gray suit, Belgian hare hat, and a silver-handled walking stick. In the Depot dining room he revealed to me that he expected to receive a call to this Church and that my time of working under him and with him would be short. And it was short, for he left in December to take up his work here in January 1930. But these twelve or fourteen weeks were to be determinative weeks in my own life. He was to be the only minister to whom I would be assistant—but in those weeks, when I could never have imagined some day succeeding him, he lived such an exemplary life and so honored the ministry of Christ as to influence my entire life.

Standing in this pulpit week after week in the place where he stood has been a solemn and humbling responsibility. But though it has been awesome it has also been thrilling for it is given only once in a generation to know, to love, and to have fellowship with one who in life and work so exalted his Lord, so completely became his servant, and so honored the holy office of a good minister of Jesus Christ.

And so today, with thanksgiving we give him back to the eternal keeping of the Heavenly Father.

Servant of God, well done
The glorious warfare's past
The battle's fought, the race is won
And thou art crowned at last.

MEMORIAL MINUTE

TO

ALBERT JOSEPH McCARTNEY

(The Board of Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary)

The distinguished life and ministry of our beloved friend and former trustee, Albert Joseph McCartney, have been eloquently memorialized by Edward L. R. Elson and need not be repeated here. It is more appropriate to suggest what the life and ministry of Albert McCartney should mean to Princeton Theological Seminary.

To any who had the privilege of hearing the great preaching of Albert, it is no news that the power and effectiveness of his message was that it was rooted in an acquaintance with and a knowledge of the holy scriptures such as has been denied to most of us of later generations. This was not had from the theological seminary, but at his mother's knees in a covenanter home where the scriptures were learned by heart and built into the thinking and faith of the growing boys. Acquaintance with similar cases, mostly in Scotland, but all of Albert's generation, leads us to wonder whether Albert's time will prove to be the last in which men could come into the theological seminary already so masterfully knowledgeable in the scriptures. And if so, should not theological education do something more than it does now, or than it then had to do, for the biblically illiterate who enter its doors? This is one meaning which the preaching of Albert might have for this seminary.

The majestic and Olympian poise of Albert during the fundamentalist controversy of the twenties should also be memorialized within the councils of the seminary that he loved so deeply. In that controversy, he differed with his brother Clarence, not in faith, but in strategy. Though inescapably involved, he surmounted the dilemma by mighty preaching of that in which he believed and that which would remain true, whatever transpired in the controversies of men. While others bickered and fought, while some accused, some offended and some defended, his preaching of the word of God rang out over the din of battle. And so, in the General Assembly of 1926, it was his voice that was heard and said by some to have "signalized the liquidation of the conflict in our church." This can be a second meaning of Albert's ministry to this seminary because again bitter theological controversy is being instigated within our church. It would be a fitting memorial to Albert, and perhaps a cause of his rejoicing in heaven, if this seminary and the fellowship of this board could so teach and preach the truth of God and of the scriptures that our voice would be heard over all the din of semantic controversy.

Finally, there have been few men who have had more faith in Princeton Theological Seminary, than did Albert. During our own stay in Washington, he was adding to the infirmities and limitations of age an agony of care for his desperately ill wife, Marie. Nevertheless each meeting of the board here in Princeton

was a soul-searching problem for him, because of his profound desire to attend and the duties and limitations which forbade it. Not that he was under any illusions as to specific contributions which he might have made, but because he deeply desired to testify, by his attendance, to his faith in this seminary and in its ministry for the Kingdom of God.

A great preacher, pastor, thinker and dedicated disciple of Christ has passed from our immediate fellowship but not from our memories.

—RALPH COOPER HUTCHISON

MEMORIAL MINUTE

TO

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN FARBER

(The Board of Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary)

Benjamin Franklin Farber was born in Thorntown, Indiana, July 13, 1882, and after he completed his elementary and high school work in that State, he entered Hanover College from which he was graduated in 1905.

He taught for a year and entered Princeton Seminary in the class of 1909 in which he was graduated. While completing his work at the Seminary he pursued the Master of Arts program at Princeton University and was awarded the M.A. degree in 1908.

His ministry began in the Presbytery of Philadelphia North where he was ordained on May 11, 1909. His first work was as Assistant Pastor in the First Church, Germantown, for the season 1909-1910. It was at this time that Mr. Farber was called to his first full charge as pastor of The First Church, Plymouth, Michigan, where he remained until 1917.

There followed a two-year term of service as Assistant Pastor of The Woodward Avenue Presbyterian Church in Detroit from 1917-1919. While engaged as Assistant in this church Mr. Farber was released during the 1918 season for War Service with the Y.M.C.A.

After World War I, a call to the Sixth Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, came to Mr. Farber and he remained there until 1926.

From 1926 to 1953, Dr. Farber was pastor of The Fourth Church, New York City, from which he retired in that year and the following year, 1954, became Pastor Emeritus.

During the year 1954, Dr. Farber served as Interim Pastor at Tenafly, New Jersey, and then began a second retirement period as a resident of Cresskill, New Jersey.

A goodly share of distinctions and honors in church and community fell upon Benjamin Farber in the course of his long and fruitful ministry. Indicative of these is the fact that as early as 1924 both Washington and Jefferson College and Grove City College conferred on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

Benjamin Farber shared with so many of us the love of Princeton Seminary from his student days. It was undoubtedly a joy to him to be called to serve the Seminary as a Trustee in 1930 in which capacity he continued until he became Trustee Emeritus.

In 1944 he was elected Secretary of The Board of Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary which post he filled with fidelity, courtesy, thoroughness and accuracy until his retirement as an active member in June, 1958. Much of the orderly procedure of The Board's Meetings and its well-documented actions go back to the care with which Benjamin Farber established practices and proposed by-laws for the guidance of the Board's affairs.

Dr. Farber contributed much to the work of The Board of Trustees beyond the recording and transacting of its business. He was always aware of growing situations and theological trends and was sensitive to the need for a wise strategy to meet the times.

As his successor in the post of Secretary, the writer is forever indebted to Benjamin Farber for his wise counsel and his with-holding patience as a learner took over an exacting task so much beloved by Dr. Farber.

He will be remembered by his denomination as a solid churchman; by the congregations he served as a faithful steward of the mysteries of the Gospel and a trusted pastor; by his associates on this Board as a valued colleague; by his wife and family as a devoted husband and father and by all as one of Christ's true men, a loyal disciple and our friend.

Benjamin Franklin Farber departed this life September 20, 1965. Dr. James I. McCord, President of the Seminary, with the pastor of the Fourth Church, New York City, the Reverend Robert Frank Tuttle, conducted the funeral service on September 23, 1965.

We pray that the God of all comfort may sustain Mrs. Farber and their son, Charles Welty Farber, in this hour of their bereavement.

—FREDERICK E. CHRISTIAN

BOOK REVIEWS

History

Ecumenics: The Science of the Church Universal, by John A. Mackay. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965. Pp. ix + 294. \$5.95.

This book gathers together much of the teaching for which John A. Mackay will be remembered by that very wide circle of men and women whom he has influenced decisively towards commitment to the Church's mission, and by the historian who tells the story of the ecumenical movement in the first half of the twentieth century. It is important as a statement of the basic themes of the ecumenical movement conceived (as it should be conceived) in missionary terms, and—perhaps even more—as the confession of faith of a great and beloved teacher.

The first part of the volume defines the origins, relations, and content of "the science of ecumenics." Of this science Dr. Mackay gives the following definition: "Ecumenics studies the Christian Churches within the context of God's purpose declared in Holy Scripture, and the human situation as it is to-day, with a view to the development of a Christian strategy worthy of the mandate of Jesus Christ to bring all nations to his allegiance, and receptive to the infinite resources made available by God to Christ's followers through the Holy Spirit." It is especially valuable to have in this section Dr. Mackay's autobiographical account of his own "re-discovery of the Church" and of the part he played in the formulation of the great slogan of Oxford 1937—"Let the Church be the Church." Coming at the present time when we are in the midst of a deep reaction against this thought, when it is generally thought reprehensible if the Church is anything other than the world, Dr. Mackay's reflections on this point are of special interest. He had lived through a mood of despair about the Church, but had come to "a new sense of the Church as a dynamic missionary community," and it is this vision of the Church which controls the present book.

Following this historical section, and a

section dealing with the relation of ecumenics to kindred subjects, we have an important chapter on "The Subject Matter of Ecumenics: The Church Universal." Here some of the most perplexing problems begin to appear. The chapter is divided into two sections: "The Church as an Empirical Fact" and "The Church as a Spiritual Reality." If one begins with this dichotomy, the problem is always to know how to relate the two. The statement that the latter is "beyond and beneath" the former does not help very much. Without attempting to pass judgment on its various visible forms, Dr. Mackay is content to insist that the Church is essentially a community, and that the one criterion by which it is to be tested is that it should be, or "should aspire to be," a missionary community in Christ." As compared with this one essential, questions of visible form, liturgy, and order are secondary.

Part II deals with "The Church in the Purpose of God." Fundamental to Dr. Mackay's exposition of this theme is the conviction that God cares for people individually. One must express gratitude for the passionate insistence with which he speaks again and again of the individual, interior aspects of Christian discipleship, of the "hidden life of the soul," of the experience of the great men and women of all Christian confessions who have tasted and known the love of God in their personal lives. The absence of this note is a terrible impoverishment of much current ecumenical thinking and talking. I cannot help wishing that there could be a clarification of the relation of this—so fundamental—element in Dr. Mackay's thought with what he says about the Church. One can agree that the Church is not an end in itself, and yet be uncomfortable with the purely functional account of the Church which some passages in the present volume suggest. God does not love men as a means to an end; he loves them! This surely means that the debate as to whether the Church is a means or an end is barren. The Church is neither: it is the first-fruit of God's redeeming action, and is therefore the place where God's love is known as a reality, a reality which impels us to share it.

This discussion bears upon Dr. Mackay's central theme: "The Church conceived as a missionary Community." After discussing some of the biblical images of the Church—the new Israel, the flock, the temple, the body, the bride—he comes finally to that which he describes as "the climactic designation of the Church" as "the Fellowship of the Road." This is the image which he selects as being the fundamental one for the understanding of the Church. The Church is a pilgrim people, and "only as a mobile, dynamic community, a fellowship on the march in every land and every culture, can the Christian Church fulfill its destiny and achieve its God-given mission." The central, indeed the burning question which has been raised by the discussion on "missionary structures for the congregation," is the question how a congregation can at the same time be the pilgrim people, and also the temple, the bride, the flock. One is bound to ask whether the New Testament permits us to take this one image as the absolutely determinative one. I think that an important contribution to this question has been made by a book which Dr. Mackay does not include in the very full bibliography which he supplies—the study entitled *Pentecost and Mission* by Harry Boer. In contrast to Dr. Mackay, Boer argues that the decisive factor in the missionary expansion of the early Church was not the so-called "Great Commission" of Matt. 28. He shows that this played no important role in the earliest period. What was essential was simply the gift of a new life, a life which—as it were—flowed out spontaneously to others. Mission was not so much a command as a gift.

In Part III Dr. Mackay describes "The Functions of the Church Universal" under four heads—worship, prophecy, evangelism, and unity. Each of these chapters is rich in material drawn from Dr. Mackay's life-long service in the Church's world mission. The difficulty, of course, is that the field is too large to permit a thorough discussion of the many points which are touched. The student of ecumenics will have to take, for example, Dr. Mackay's discussion of worship in the several communions as a starting point for the study of what scholars of those communions themselves have written to interpret their practice of worship. The twenty lines

into which the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Church is compressed cannot do justice to the new movements of thought in that Church—movements to which Dr. Mackay elsewhere makes appreciative reference. In his cordial account of the Church of South India he expresses the hope that the Lambeth Conference will one day do what it already did in 1958. The extended critique of the famous "Blake-Pike" proposals for unity might be held to be somewhat out of proportion to the scale of the discussion as a whole. But this reviewer finds himself moved to admiration by the ringing courage of the writer's declarations on some of the most urgent issues of our time—especially in the chapter entitled "The Church's Prophetic Function."

Part IV deals with "The Relations of the Church Universal." Here again the problem is one of scale. Five pages do not give room to say anything very substantial on the burning question of the relation of the Gospel to other faiths. In his discussion of secularism and "neo-secularism," Dr. Mackay gives no ground to those who would "substitute obeisance to secular pluralism for subjection to Christian absolutes," to those who propound the view "that, inasmuch as the world has already been reconciled to God, commitment to God as a ground for acceptance by him and of reconciliation to him, has no meaning." Above all, he will have none of the "cult of the uncommitted." Discipleship is a matter of passionate commitment, rooted in wonder and gratitude at the love of God in Jesus Christ. Out of this passionate commitment arises both his urgent sense of the duty of evangelism, and his downright condemnation of those—including the General Board of the National Council of Churches—who have, in his judgment, failed to speak the necessary word to the Government of the United States on the subject of relations with Christians in Cuba and China.

Reflection on the book as a whole prompts one question which this reviewer asks with diffidence, because he is not himself a teacher of Theology. It is the question of the status of "The Science of Ecumenics" as a separate theological discipline. The very fact that Dr. Mackay's book has to cover so vast a canvas, and has therefore—inevitably—to deal so slightly with so many deep and difficult

issues, prompts the question whether this is indeed a separate subject in the theological curriculum. Is the truth not rather this: that the whole theological curriculum has to be re-conceived in the kind of terms which Dr. Mackay sets for his own study—in terms, that is to say, of the whole Church conceived as a missionary community? I believe that this question echoes Dr. Mackay's own convictions, and that perhaps the true fruit of his work might be precisely that a textbook on "Ecumenics" became unnecessary because the entire course of theological study was directed "to the development of a Christian strategy worthy of the mandate of Jesus Christ to bring all men to his allegiance."

But for this reviewer the final word must be one of gratitude and admiration for this passionate, prophetic and triumphant testimony to Jesus Christ. Dr. Mackay has held a unique place in the world mission of the Church during the past forty years as evangelist, prophet, statesman, theologian, and fearless spokesman for his Lord. Above all this book is testimony to Jesus Christ. An Indian friend of mine gave to one of his books the title *One Who Won My Heart*. Jesus Christ won the heart of John Mackay, and out of that conquest has come a lifetime of witness to his glory. For all that this book distills of that witness, let God be thanked.

LESSLIE NEWBIGIN

Church of South India
Madras

The Early Christian Church, by J. G. Davies. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1965. Pp. 314. \$8.50.

In this book Dr. J. G. Davies, Professor of Theology at the University of Birmingham, England, and the author of several works in the field of early Christianity, tells the story of the Christian Church from its earliest beginnings to the end of the sixth century—i.e., its development from being an obscure and illegal minority in the Roman Empire to being the only established religion in that Empire.

Dr. Davies begins with a chapter on the Old Testament background of Christianity, and the message and ministry of Jesus Christ. His next chapter deals with the Apostolic

age, during which the Church, inspired and impelled by the Holy Spirit, proceeded to preach its Gospel to Gentiles as well as Jews, and to carry its message as far west as Rome, if not Spain. Thereafter Dr. Davies devotes a chapter to each successive century. He organizes his material in each chapter under the same inter-related headings—Background, Sources, Expansion and Development, Beliefs, Worship, and Social Life; and in this way he covers every significant aspect of the Church's on-going activity and ministry. And after completing his well-rounded exposition he appends a carefully chosen bibliography in each of the categories into which his material has been arranged.

Dr. Davies writes with clarity and interest, and with obvious command over both primary sources and immediate secondary works. One or two of his assertions might perhaps be questioned. For example, on p. 100, speaking about belief in a Millennium in the second century he says that "widespread though this chiliastic was, its acceptance by the Montanists brought it into discredit, but it continued to have a place in Christian belief in the form of the doctrines of purgatory and of the exemption of the saints from a period of waiting after death and of their immediate enjoyment of the bliss of heaven"; but he cites no proof for this statement. But nevertheless the present reviewer agrees with Dr. Kenneth S. Latourette in calling this book "quite the best survey of the period," since it combines readability with sound scholarship and can be heartily commended as an introduction to the first five centuries of the Church."

On p. 115, line 34, "as" is clearly a misprint for "than." And on p. 216 the date of Canossa is given as 1070, instead of 1077. These misprints should be corrected in future editions of this fine work.

NORMAN V. HOPE

The Deacon Wore Spats: Profiles from America's Changing Religious Scene, by John T. Stewart. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1965. Pp. 191. \$4.95.

The author of this book, John T. Stewart, is not only an ordained minister with wide

pastoral experience, but also a long-time Religion Editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. As such he has had what might be called a ring-side seat at the changing American religious scene during the present century; and in this book he describes that scene as he has witnessed it.

Preaching has changed from what Mr. Stewart calls "apple-blossom rhetoric"—exemplified by the late Methodist bishop, W. A. Quayle—to the "plain talk" of men like Norman Vincent Peale and Martin E. Marty. And its content has altered from glad, confident optimism about man's nature and his earthly future, to a deep awareness of his sinfulness and the problems by which he is beset.

The attitude of the Church to the American community has—largely at least—changed from an almost exclusive emphasis on individual salvation to a concern for social justice and human rights. The usual name given to this movement is the Social Gospel, whose chief theological exponent was Walter Rauschenbusch. The same kind of social concern can be seen in the widespread growth of pacifism among United States clergymen during the period between World War I and World War II, and more recently in the participation of so many ministers in the Negro Civil Rights movement.

This 20th century has also witnessed a change in the expressed attitude of American Christians to the Church's world mission. 1900 saw the publication of John R. Mott's book "The Evangelization of the World in This Generation." Since then, however, a more chastened and less optimistic attitude has developed towards the immediate likelihood of world conversion. And while Christian missionaries have continued their work in countries still open to them, their attitude has changed from paternal condescension towards native Christians to fraternal cooperation with them.

An equally striking change has come over the relations of American Christians to one another. Rivalry has been replaced by friendliness. Federations of churches at all levels have been organized; and church mergers, not only among denominations of the same family, but even across denominational lines, have taken place. And in 1960 a sermon by Eugene C. Blake brought into being the

consultation on Church Union, which envisages a merger of six large Protestant denominations with a total membership of over 20,000,000.

Such are some of the major trends noted by Mr. Stewart in this book. But since he is interested in individuals as well as movements his volume is studded with perceptive sketches of leading church figures from John R. Mott through Harry Emerson Fosdick, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Ernest F. Tittle—concerning whom he says that "The Methodist Church has never acknowledged its debt to Tittle for his contribution to the Church's reputation for intellectual honesty" (p. 89)—to Norman Peale and Billy Graham. But he is well aware of the fact that, while the Christian cause has been admirably served by such outstanding and gifted leaders, it has also owed much to humble and obscure ministers and laymen who never make the headlines, but who are among the unsung heroes of the Church. To them he pays a well-deserved tribute.

Altogether this is a fascinating story admirably told by a well-qualified first-hand observer.

NORMAN V. HOPE

Changeful Page, The Autobiography of William Wand, Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., London, 1965. Pp. 217. 25 shillings.

J. W. C. Wand has had a distinguished career as an Anglican clergyman. Though he did not attend one of what William Temple once described as "those large private institutions miscalled public schools," he won a scholarship to Oxford, where he took a First in Theology. After a year at a theological college in Newcastle-on-Tyne, and subsequent ordination to the priesthood, he served as a parish clergyman, with time off for chaplaincy duty during World War I. In 1925 he was appointed Dean of Oriel College, Oxford University; in 1934 he became Archbishop of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia; and in 1943 he returned to England as Bishop of Bath and Wells. In 1945 he was translated to the See of London, which, allegedly, Dean A. P. Stanley described as "next to the Bishopric of Rome, the most important position in Christendom."

Since his retirement from the Bishopric of London in 1955 Dr. Wand has been a Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.

In this book he tells the story of his life. He does so with becoming modesty: for though he is highly gifted as speaker, writer, administrator, and not least as pastor, these gifts are played down in his story. He also writes with frankness: he makes no attempt to conceal his mistakes (from which, however, he was careful to profit), and he speaks with delicacy and sensitiveness about the tragic death of his son, Paul, while climbing in the Alps. He also writes interestingly; his book is sprinkled with humor and enlivened with revealing glimpses of the great—such as William Temple and Winston Churchill—and the near great, with whom Dr. Wand has been associated in his public career.

His story is essentially one of hard work. For example, in the course of his busy life he has found time to write over thirty books. He gives this explanation of how he has managed to do this: "Some kindly enquirer once asked me how I found time for so much writing and I answered that as I neither played bridge nor did crossword puzzles I had all the time there was" (p. 210).

At the present time when the various Christian communions are seeking to learn more about and from one another, this book should be read and pondered far beyond the bounds of the Anglican communion which the author has served so well and so long.

NORMAN V. HOPE

The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland 1500-1600, by Duncan Shaw. The Saint Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1964. Pp. 261. 42 shillings.

The establishment of Protestantism in Scotland is usually dated from 1560; and in that year there took place the first meeting of the General Assembly as the highest court of the reformed Church of Scotland. To begin with, the leaders of the Protestant movement in Scotland—men like John Knox—espoused the medieval idea that church and state were two functions of the one Christian society or commonwealth. Accordingly, the General Assembly was envisaged

as being a body in which all sections of Scottish society should be represented—"the generall assemblie of this haill Realme," as an Act of Parliament of 1567 described it. But in the course of the next quarter-century, a new concept of church-state relations gained ascendancy in Scotland. This was the Presbyterian view, according to which—in the words of Gordon Donaldson—"church and state do not form one society but two societies, which are to be kept carefully distinct" (*The Scottish Reformation*, p. 186). For the emergence and triumph of this new viewpoint there were at least two reasons. The first was the difficulties which the Church of Scotland had with successive political rulers—Mary, Queen of Scots, the Regent Morton, and King James VI. The second was the powerful influence of Andrew Melville (1545-1622), a convinced Presbyterian who, after his return to Scotland from Geneva in 1574, became a highly articulate and persuasive advocate of the two-kingdom theory. Largely because of Melville's influence, in 1578 the Second Book of Discipline, which embodied this theory, was adopted by the Church. Under the influence of this new viewpoint the General Assembly changed its character and became strictly the General Assembly of the Church, which attempted to live alongside the political state with a place and function of its own; and its voting membership came to consist of none but "ecclesiastical persons"—i.e. representatives exclusively of the Church, commissioned by synods and later by presbyteries.

In this important book Duncan Shaw presents a carefully documented account of the origin and development of the General Assembly during the first forty years of its existence. He has mastered all the relevant source materials, imperfect as some of these are; and he is also familiar with the secondary works. On the basis of his full and expert information, he covers just about every conceivable aspect of his subject—the composition of the General Assembly, its legal status, its times and places of meeting, and its appointed officials, such as the Clerk, the Advocate, the Solicitor, and the Comptroller. He rounds out his story with chapters on the development of the subordinate courts of the church, i.e. synods and presbyteries, and the relationship of the Gen-

eral Assembly to the Scottish universities and schools.

Altogether this authoritative work is likely to take rank as the standard treatise on its subject.

NORMAN V. HOPE

Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion: A New Introduction, by Richard R. Niebuhr. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964. Pp. 267 + xv. \$5.95.

One is drawn to this work almost automatically if only on professional grounds. Was it not Adolf von Harnack who compared Rudolf Otto's masterpiece, *The Idea of the Holy*, with Schleiermacher's *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*? Every historian of religion knows that Rudolf Otto (1869-1937) conveyed the ideas of Schleiermacher (1768-1834) against a worldwide setting. Professor Richard R. Niebuhr of the faculty of the Harvard Divinity School has produced in the form of a systematic theology a meticulous study of Schleiermacher based on solid research. His examination of the documents has enabled him to assess Schleiermacher's thinking on Christ, religion, and theology.

The two great Protestant theologians of the first half of the nineteenth century, Schleiermacher and Kierkegaard, both owe much to Romanticist inspiration. The pietism of the *ecclesiola*e ("Gemeinschaften") and Romanticism determined—with the philosophy of Kant—the world view of the young Schleiermacher and of his famous discourses on religion addressed to the educated among the contemptuous. His thought was also steeped in the ideas of Spinoza and Leibniz. In his debt, moreover, are such foremost authorities as Ritschl and Troeltsch. His contribution to the history of religion may be surmised from the weighty thesis which he advanced, that religion was based on intuition and feeling, independent of all dogma. In *The Christian Faith*—the chief source for his theology—he defines religion as the feeling of absolute dependence which finds its purest expression in monotheism. He held that the variety of forms which this feeling assumes in different individuals

and nations accounts for the diversity of religions, of which Christianity is the highest, though not the only true one.

This influence of Schleiermacher has been diminished, as the author attests, by a powerful reaction connected especially with the names of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. They oppose to his "feeling" the Scriptural principle of the Reformers. An aim of the volume is to right the balance by showing more accurately how Schleiermacher has been misunderstood and misinterpreted first by Brunner and Barth, and consequently by other present day theologians.

Professor Niebuhr grapples with the central theme of Schleiermacher's religious consciousness through a series of "moments." He admits a certain incongruity: between, on the one hand, Augustine's "Our hearts are restless . . .," Calvin's stately opening sentences in the *Institutes*, and Edwards' vivid passage on the new sense of the heart for the excellency of God, and on the other, Schleiermacher's dense, dry language in the *Christian Faith* where he stipulates the relation between the God-consciousness and the world consciousness. Nevertheless, even the most problematical interpreter of Schleiermacher's theological thinking cannot overlook the fact that his statement of the religious situation is not essentially different from that with which the Augustinian-Reformed tradition has long since made the Western world familiar.

This is what Professor Niebuhr writes on the central issue of Schleiermacher's concept of religion: "Religion as a universal human phenomenon symbolizing the inextricable relatedness of personal existence led Schleiermacher to take his stand in the tradition that is constrained to begin its thinking with a God who is already in relation to man and with a human nature already in relation to God, because personal existence is given in and through that relation. It is this fact that is at once the first certitude and the greatest disturbance in human selfhood (pp. 193-4)."

In short, one way to evaluate this volume and the great Schleiermacher himself would be by joining issue, even negatively dissenting at many points. But this could not be our attitude in everything. The fact is there is not a single theologian since the Reforma-

tion who stands comparison with Schleiermacher in systematizing power and continuing influence. He did not simply spin old threads. He found his greatness in a living dialogue with his time. Out of this polarity there came to him ideas which under many different headings are still with us today.

EDWARD J. JURJI

The Christian Centuries. A New History of the Catholic Church. Volume One. The First Six Hundred Years. Part I by Jean Daniélou. Part II by Henri I. Marrou (trans. by V. Cronin). Illustrations selected and annotated by P. Ludlow. Introduction by John Tracy Ellis. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1964. Pp. 523. \$12.50.

This impressive volume inaugurates a new five-volume series on the whole sweep of church history from the Roman Catholic viewpoint. Conceived by Louis Rogier, Roger Aubert and David Knowles, the contributors also include, besides the two authors of this present volume, G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, S.J. and Hermann Tüchle, together with two specialists for the Eastern Churches, J. Hajjar and D. Obolensky. The American "consultant," John Tracy Ellis, supplies a general introduction for the series. This international orientation is further exhibited in the consortium of publishers from five different countries which is producing the work.

The series is conceived, not to rival the twenty-volume Fliche-Martin history, but as *haute vulgarisation*, a synthetic readable presentation for the educated public of the state of current scholarship, by masters of the discipline. The authors write in the candid irenic spirit now so widespread in the church and reflect current interests in liturgy, the life of the laity, the world scope of the faith as well as ecumenism.

The first volume is perhaps best compared to the well-known longer works of Duchesne and Lietzmann, and stands the comparison well. One suspects that the general character of the whole is better indicated by Pro-

fessor Marrou's Part, beginning with the Constantinian revolution, which is a lucid, well-organized and proportioned exposition without many surprises. Professor Daniélou's portion, in contrast, and especially his first six chapters, are likely to strike the reader who is not aware of what has been going on in this field in the last twenty years as quite unfamiliar. The author has attempted to correct the one-sided emphasis of our best known sources by sketching the history of the Jewish Christianity which actually dominated the first generations of church history, utilizing to the full the new source discoveries and the new perspectives on gnosticism. The historical landscape that emerges will seem as strange to most Protestant readers as to Roman Catholics.

There are forty-eight well-chosen annotated plates, which are more successful than the outline maps and the bibliographical helps.

JAMES H. NICHOLS

Men Who Shaped the Western Church, by Hans von Campenhausen (trans. by Manfred Hoffman). Harper and Row, New York, 1964. Pp. 328. \$5.95.

This companion piece to *The Fathers of the Greek Church* offers lively, succinct and expert essays on each of Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Boethius. The two collections present the Heidelberg patristics scholar as a brilliant popularizer, waiving footnotes and apparatus, touching confidently on special technical problems where necessary. The biographical method absolves the author of responsibility for systematic history of doctrine or institutions, yet enables him to indicate briefly and precisely the crucial turns of the development. Augustine, as one might expect, is assigned more than a quarter of the total bulk. The distinctive lineaments of Western Latin Christianity emerge sharply from the frequent comparisons with those of the Greeks. The bibliographical suggestions have been supplemented by the translator for the benefit of English-speaking readers.

JAMES H. NICHOLS

Biblical

All the Kingdoms of the Earth, by Norman K. Gottwald. Harper & Row, New York, 1964. Pp. xiii + 448. \$7.00.

In this well written, attractively produced volume Professor Gottwald traces the conduct of international politics from 2800 to 333 B.C. against the historical backdrop of the ancient Near Eastern peoples, with special emphasis on the role that the Old Testament prophet played in Israel's dealings with the nations around her. As an introduction to his study the author shows how political institutions developed in the Near East from the city-states of ancient Mesopotamia to the highly complex empires of a later time, like those of the Assyrians, the Neo-Babylonians and the Persians. All through this long period there persisted with surprising uniformity a pattern of international conduct, consisting mainly of treaties of all kinds, the use of military power to settle disputes, enforced submission of conquered nations, and especially from Assyrian times on, the deportation of whole populations to make the rebellion of conquered territories less possible.

The Hebrews, who came upon the scene of Near Eastern history at a relatively late date, soon found themselves involved in international politics because of their exposed position in the Fertile Crescent. The role that the prophet played in this important phase of Israel's national life is the subject of the main section of this book. A careful study of the prophetic references to international relations is made in the light of the new historical knowledge of the Near East. Gottwald's superb historical scholarship and wide knowledge of the sources make this the strongest part of the book.

Both old and new patterns, or models, of international relations, suggested by the prophets for Israel to follow in her dealings with foreign nations, are pointed out by the author. The most unique and revolutionary models are those which view Israel as the refuge and gathering place for individual converts (Isa. 56:6), or as the partner in an international federation (Isa. 19:19-25), or as a priestly enclave in a single world

empire (Isa. 44:28-45:7; the Servant Songs, especially chap. 53).

The dynamics of the prophet's political consciousness are to be found in his personal relationship with God and his deep trust in the divine control of history. To each political crisis the prophet brings to bear the living word of God which not only judges the nation because of its sins, but also creates new political patterns by which the nations of the world can live in harmony and peace.

The only criticism of the author's method that might be offered is that he pays too much attention to the detailed historical study of the prophetic passages without giving enough attention to the form-critical analysis of the oracles. Perhaps even a better integration of the historical and theological dimensions of the prophets' political teachings would have been attained with a more thorough study of the literary history of the texts.

This book is a major contribution to an important aspect of the thought and activity of the prophets. Its reference value is enhanced by twenty maps correlated with the text, a full bibliography and complete indices.

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

The Anchor Bible: Proverbs. Ecclesiastes. Introduction, Translation and Notes, by R. B. Y. Scott. Doubleday & Co., New York, 1965. Pp. liii + 257. \$6.00.

Enough has been written on the purpose and plan of *The Anchor Bible* series in pre-publication build-ups, in the numerous reviews of the volumes which have already appeared and of course in the foreword of the editors in each volume to warrant silence on this subject in this brief review. The critical response to the "commentaries" already published has been somewhat less than enthusiastic, not so much on account of the material itself, but rather because of the limitations imposed upon the writers by the format and purpose of the series. There is no question, however, about the merits of the present volume under review which is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament.

After giving a clear and comprehensive survey of the Wisdom Movement in the ancient Near East, Professor Scott, of Princeton University, deals with the specific characteristics and contributions of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes in separate Introductions to each of these books. In the discussion of the Canaanite influence on Hebrew Wisdom (p. xli) mention might have been made of the Canaanite names Ethan, the Ezrahite (i.e., the native), Heman, Calcol and Darda, which appear in the list of traditional wise men (I Kings 4:31; cf. also I Chron. 2:6). The fact that these men were members of musical guilds also emphasizes the important role that music played in the Wisdom Movement (cf. I Kings 4:32).

Dr. Scott's translation of both Proverbs and Ecclesiastes is not only a considerable scholarly contribution to Biblical studies; it is also a high literary achievement. In many places the results of Ugaritic studies have been utilized to bring out the correct meaning of the Hebrew text. A spot check reveals the following examples: Prov. 1:23; 2:22b; 3:10 (where no emendation is suggested for *sābō'*, which from Northwest Semitic sources is now known to mean "grain"); 5:7; 8:22 (where *darkō* is translated "his sovereignty" on the basis of Ugaritic *drkt* "dominion, authority"); 9:3; 10:11, 18, 31-32; 13:9; 14:4; 16:30; 17:1; 19:6, 8, 15; 22:3; 23:30; 25:3 (where *'āreṣ* means "netherworld"; also in 11:31, where Scott, however, translates "earth"). In Eccl. 3:11 the familiar phrase, "He also has put eternity into man's mind," now gives way to "Yet he has put in their minds an enigma," on the strength of an Ugaritic etymology and the better sense of this translation in the context.

It would seem, on the other hand, that there is no need to emend *'ādām* to *'ādāmāh* in Prov. 30:14b on the basis of several Biblical texts (cf. Isa. 29:19; Jer. 32:20; Job 36:28, etc.) and Ugaritic parallels. Professor Scott does not accept the reading of the difficult word *l'iti'el* in Prov. 30:1b as a proper name (cf. RSV) which could mean "I, El, prevail" with the discovery of a Northwest Semitic root *l'y* meaning "to prevail." The translation "well-stored house" in Prov. 21:9 (also 25:24; cf. RSV) is attested from an Ugaritic parallel (see the

reviewer's comment in his "Proverbs," *loc.cit.* in *The Interpreter's Bible*). The credit for the translation "like glaze" in Prov. 26:23 belongs to H. L. Ginsberg (*BASOR* [April, 1945] p. 21, n. 55) who discovered the parallel of the Hebrew word in Ugaritic (see *IB*, *loc.cit.*). Scott's own discovery that the preposition *'aḥar* denotes "with" in Eccles. 12:2 (cf. Ruth 1:15-16), rather than "after" was first announced in *JTS* 50 (1949) 178.

In view of the fact that "life" is in parallelism with "deathlessness" in Prov. 12:28, it is possible that the phrase *l'ehayyim* in 10:16, 11:19 and 19:23 may also have the meaning of "immortality" or "future life." Professor Scott believes, however, that the "relationship of righteousness and immortality" is expressed only in 12:28 (p. 92; but cf. especially 10:16, and 11:30 where "tree of life" may be a symbol of eternal life). From Ugaritic parallels it is also possible that *'aḥarit* in Prov. 23:18, 24:14 and 24:20 may mean "further, or, future life."

The high quality of scholarship, the literary excellence of the translation and the clear exposition of the thought world of the Wisdom School make this volume a notable contribution to the better understanding of a much neglected field of Biblical studies.

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

Shechem, by G. Ernest Wright. McGraw Hill Book Company, New York, 1965. Pp. 270 + 113 figs. \$7.95.

In this "biography of a biblical city," Professor Wright presents another book in a new literary genre of our age—readable excavations reports!

The first two chapters of the book introduce the reader, lay or professional, to the background of Biblical Shechem, including the historical, geographical, geological, political, and related aspects. This provides the reader with the necessary data to understand why Shechem was important in antiquity—and why Biblical archaeology is important today as basic research in the study of the Bible and its modern meaning.

Chapters 3 and 4 of the volume then unfold the actual report of archaeological work conducted on the site, their results, and their

meaning. The ill-fated Sellin excavations are rehearsed in some detail, to bring the reader up-to-date, and then the background of the Drew-McCormick Expedition, in terms of its planning and preparation, as well as its actual work, is presented. In both cases, laymen's terms are used, professional jargon is explained, and an attempt is made to make the complexity of modern archaeology intelligible to the reader. The thirteen major strata of Shechem's history, from about 107 B.C. back to sometime before 860 B.C., are spelled out as a prelude to the detailed information in the succeeding chapters of the book.

Chapters 5 (the fortifications of the city), 6 (the El-Berith Temple), 7 (the Court-yard Temples), and 8 (the sacral importance of the site, biblically), are more definitely "technical," but are equally well-written and easily understood by the non-archaeologist. It is actually in these chapters that Wright highlights the importance of archaeological excavations, archaeological recording, and archaeological publication for theological studies in modern times. He shows how archaeology can contribute valuable information, with direct relevance to biblical study, historically, linguistically, geographically, and theologically, including that related to the transmission of the biblical record, itself. These chapters indeed preclude Wright's *apologia*, in his Introduction, for the role of biblical archaeologists in theological circles—and his own work precludes any apology, in the modern sense, for "theologians" as archaeologists!

The final chapters of the book, 9 and 10, bring together the archaeological, historical, and Biblical material directly relating to the excavation results. A good discussion of Noth's amphictyonic viewpoint is presented, although one must admit that the author still adheres to W. F. Albright's position regarding the basic origins of Yahwehism. New insight is also brought to the Samaritan problem and the relatively unknown biblical period in which it developed. Quite justifiably, the role of Shechem in Israel's development and history is emphasized. For the professional, the pin-pointing of the chronology of Samaria Ware is most important and constitutes another valuable contribution of the work at Shechem.

The appendices, six in number, present a variety of technical, but fully readable, briefs on various aspects of the excavations, including field techniques, epigraphy, hydrology, stratigraphy, and specific ceramic notes. Ample footnotes, a full index, good photographs, excellent drawn figures, and general format and typography make this a most intelligible book and one whose value for reference will persist.

This reviewer must note a few points of divergence and critical comment, however. Wright's concept of a Shechemite "enclave" entering the Israelite nation by covenant (referring to Jos. 8:30-35; 24), ignores completely the possibility that the "covenant" at Shechem was, itself, the *original* "Israelite" covenant, and not some recapitulation of agreements, reiterating or enlarging, a former covenant made at Sinai. Further, this reviewer finds certain aspects of Wright's technical terminology difficult: this is especially so in the employment of the terms "stratum," "horizon," "phase," and "level." That this represents a difference in methodological opinion is admitted, but it also does seem to open the way for still further confusion in recognized terminology in the field. Likewise, the use of "the State of (North) Israel," for "Northern Kingdom," or even as an elaboration of "Israel," seems unnecessary. Wright's comments on methodology, which give the impression of uniqueness, must also be tempered by the realization that scientific Near Eastern archaeology, in general, has moved toward the adoption of similar techniques for some years. Through Kenyon's training, many now in the field follow individually modified patterns of the same technique, which is no longer a fact particularly exciting. Along this line, for example, this reviewer would press for more extensive field demarcation of excavated levels and their final appearance as section drawings. On the other hand, the pottery drawings of the book, which constitute the heart of chronological study, are excellent, and bode well for the quality to be expected in final reports on the periods involved.

Shechem is a book to be recommended for Biblical students, researchers in the fields of biblical history and every-day life, the casual reader, and those whose deliberations

the pick and spade must more and more guide, in terms of the actual origins and meanings of the development of biblical thought.

PHILIP C. HAMMOND

Studia Evangelica, vols. II and III, edited by F. L. Cross. (= *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bände 87 and 88.) Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1964. Pp. 680, and 498. DM 81, and 59.

These two volumes contain one hundred and twelve papers that were presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1961. The papers are grouped under two main headings, "The New Testament Scriptures," and "The New Testament Message," and these in turn are subdivided into general problems and specific subjects on the Gospels and on the Apostolic Age; on the person of Jesus Christ; theology; liturgy; textual criticism; the New Testament in history; and miscellanea. Most of the papers are in English; ten are in French, and ten in German.

At the risk of making an invidious choice among many excellent papers, attention may be directed to several contributions which, for one reason or another, were of special interest to the reviewer.

In a discussion of "Christ in the Old Testament according to Hebrews," A. T. Hanson of the University of Hull points out that a careful exegesis of the Letter to the Hebrews reveals several passages which presuppose the belief that Christ was active in Old Testament times. Thus, Heb. 3:2 seems to teach that Christ was faithful to God as Moses was faithful in all his (i.e. Christ's) house. The elaborate argument of chap. 7 concerning the figure of Melchizedek suggests that for the *auctor ad Hebraeos* the pre-incarnate Christ appeared to Abraham in the person of Melchizedek, thereby indicating the superiority of the coming Messianic priesthood to the coming Levitical priesthood. Finally, in Heb. 12:22-27, which is an exceptionally obscure passage, Hanson makes out a case for understanding that it is Christ who is envisaged as speaking the warning oracle on Mount Sinai, and Christ

whose voice was so terrible that the Israelites asked Moses to be their mediator, and Christ whose voice then shook the earth. Whatever one may think of Hanson's exegesis of these three passages, it is certainly not unprofitable to explore how far in the first century (besides the well-known passage in I Cor. 10:4) there are anticipations of the full-blown doctrine of the pre-existent Logos which was current in the second century and held by Justin Martyr and some of his contemporaries.

G. B. Caird of Oxford discusses "The Descent of Christ in Ephesians 4, 7-11." Rejecting the two principal interpretations of the passage, namely, that the descent was that involved in the Incarnation, or that it was Christ's descent into Hades, Caird proposes that the exigencies of the passage are most fully met by understanding the descent as Christ's return at Pentecost to bestow his spiritual gifts upon the Church. The special merit of Caird's paper is the extensive use made of Rabbinic evidence to support the proposed interpretation.

In his paper entitled "Some Remarks on the Text of I Peter in the Bodmer Papyrus" F. W. Beare of Toronto points out five passages where P⁷² supports the Byzantine text against the testimony of two or more important witnesses of the Alexandrian group. He concludes with the statement: "In this epistle, I do not think that either B or aleph should be regarded as superior in any marked degree to A and Ψ, both of which offer a text of remarkable purity. I should myself be inclined to give serious consideration to any reading in which either of them supports the Byzantine text against even the combined testimony of B and aleph."

There is not space here to discuss the contributions made by other authors in this symposium, except to mention that Günther Bornkamm threshes over again the straw of "The Problem of the Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ," R. H. Fuller examines the implications of Jesus' logion concerning those who are ashamed of him and his words (it shows that Jesus understood himself as the one through whom God was uttering his last eschatological word to Israel, by which men's salvation or damnation would be decided), H. J. Cadbury writes a characteristically salty and suggestive es-

say on "Looking at the Gospels Backwards," and H. K. McArthur offers some interesting information about "The Earliest Divisions in the Gospels."

BRUCE M. METZGER

Theology

The Demands of Freedom, by Helmut Gollwitzer (trans. by Robert W. Fenn, with an introductory essay by Paul Oestreicher). Harper & Row, New York, 1965. Pp. 176. \$3.00.

Helmut Gollwitzer is probably the most popular and the most controversial theologian in Germany today. He is a philosopher and theologian who has written an outstanding work on *The Existence of God* (recently published in English, by the Fortress Press, 1965) and a Biblical commentator (*The Dying and the Living Lord*, commentary on the Lucan Passion story). But, his principal reputation in his home country rests on a unique combination of profound theological scholarship in the spirit of Martin Luther and Karl Barth, with a vigorous political involvement in the problems of his land. These are not two things for Gollwitzer, but one. His earliest ministry was in the German Confessing Church, which involved an anti-Nazi decision basic to his ordination. He taught in the illegal Confessing Church Seminary in Berlin, spent time in the Gestapo jail, followed Martin Niemöller in the pulpit of Berlin-Dahlem when the latter was arrested, and finally was drafted to five years in Hitler's army (during which he held true to a private pledge never to shoot at an enemy) followed by five years as a prisoner of war in the Soviet Union.

This is the stuff of which Gollwitzer's theology is made. Shortly after returning from Russia to an immediate appointment as Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn, he published an account of his prison experience (*Unwilling Journey*, Fortress Press, 1953). It went through over ten editions in German and still stands today as one of the most sensitive reflections on Stalin's Communism from a Christian point of view, ever written. The author, however,

did not leave the matter there. In Bonn, and later in Berlin, he remained in sharp but open dialogue with Marxists, and in communion of spirit with the Church in Communist countries. He took up the cause of peace in Germany and became one of the country's leading opponents of nuclear armament. But he enclosed all of this in a preaching ministry alongside his professorial responsibilities which has made him one of his country's foremost interpreters of the Christian faith to the secular world. It is this dialogue with Communism, this Christian attack upon nuclear war, and this preaching ministry to post-war Germany, which are reflected in the present volume.

The writings are occasional, having been composed for different events and needs over the past fifteen years. They are introduced in an excellent biographical essay by an Englishman who was a former student. However, the cement which holds them together is theological, as in such themes—repentance, freedom, and responsibility.

Repentance is the first movement of the Christian life, vividly illustrated by Germany's need for such to provide a basis for any national life at all in the post-war world. There can be no Christian message as long as Christians themselves do not recognize their own responsibility for the conflicts with which the world is beset and the lust for earthly security which gives rise to them. There can be no Christian ministry to Marxists without a confession of the degree of justice in Marxist attacks upon the Church.

But repentance is the fruit and source of freedom. The Christian is free not because he lives in a free country but because "he is the slave of another." Christ has liberated him from bondage to any social system, from the absolute claims of any national or other earthly loyalty. He is free to be for all men as God is in Christ, because he does not have to stake his existence on loyalty to one group against another. He is free from possession by demons of fear, hate, self-love to serve his neighbor. He is therefore not afraid of Communism or any other enemy, but finds there an opportunity to witness and serve.

Therefore the Christian has a special responsibility, for the reconciliation of enemies and the peace of the world. He is grant-

ed a freer imagination to find ways in which interests may coincide, ideologies change, dictators become more humane, and justice be established. He is the custodian of practical hope in a world where conflicts often seem hopeless.

These general terms are spelled out by the book's essays in positions taken on events. Not every reader will agree with the spelling. The present reviewer for instance, cannot follow the author into nuclear pacifism. But the book is an introduction to the pulse of prophetic Christianity in a divided Germany, and to the mind of one of its greatest exponents.

CHARLES C. WEST

Practical Theology

The True Wilderness, by Harry A. Williams. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, 1965. Pp. 168. \$2.95.

This is a compact book of real substance. Hugh Montefiore calls it "a spiritual classic" and Norman Pittenger describes it as "an extraordinarily perceptive presentation of the Christian gospel meeting men's deepest needs." It consists of a series of sermons given in Trinity College, Cambridge, where Williams serves as Dean of the Chapel and Tutor in Theology. Many of us were given an introduction to his mode of thinking in an essay on psychological objections in *Objections to Christian Belief* (Lippincott, 1964).

These sermons are exceedingly well written, provocative, and "valuable not just for Christians but for many who would not normally feel themselves to be religious." Apart from the messages he felt he must share, the author undertook the writing and composition of this series as a challenge and corrective. As a teacher he is convinced that "academic theology is as essential for a knowledge of Christian truth as a house is to a home. But only if it becomes part of what I am, like my home, can it be the living truth which Christ came to give. . . . Therefore I decided that alongside of teaching academic theology I would try to ask myself how far and in what way a doctrine of the creed or a saying of Christ had become part of what I am" (p. 8). The result,

then, is a collection of highly original sermons marked by rare personal testimony and emerging from a resolve "not to preach about any aspect of my Christian belief unless it had become part of my own life-blood."

The themes are somewhat conventional and the texts are from among the great and well-known verses of the New Testament. The preacher, however, is a first rate thinker and is equally at home as a shrewd critic of contemporary Christianity and as an interpreter of its relationship to the "wilderness" inside all of us. Ministers will discover through reading this series that a book of excellent preaching is a better teacher than several average volumes about preaching.

DONALD MACLEOD

Selected Prayers, by Karl Barth. John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1965. Pp. 72. \$1.00 (paper).

One learns a lot about a man's beliefs from his religious books, but much can be discerned about the whole man from reading a collection of his prayers. We are grateful to John Knox Press and to Keith R. Crim, the translator, for making available to us a collection of the prayers of Karl Barth. In the Foreword to this modest paperback, Professor Barth eschews any claim to skill in liturgical craftsmanship; indeed he quotes the judgment of one of his fellow churchmen who said to him at the close of a service, "You get an *A* for the sermon, but an *F* for the liturgy." Moreover, he expresses little liking for books of worship and tells of his own custom of preparing prayers only in close relationship to each sermon. In this way they contribute to that wholeness which should mark every act of public worship.

These prayers follow for the most part the pattern of the Church Year, along with the miscellaneous group of a more personal character. The reader is struck by the inclusiveness of Barth's petitions: he prays for "Christians by conviction and Christians by convention;" for "those who believe and those who half-believe"; for the end of the "cold war" to needs of the University population; for the welfare of politicians to the criminals lodged in jail. His emphases are invariably no sign of cheap familiarity;

his devotional language brings within our concern "those who are sick in body and the many who are sick of life itself" and his use of Biblical imagery gives the dimension of height to common prayer. This is a handy volume to be recommended to devotional groups. Churches should purchase it in bulk lots and distribute it among young people as a memento of a new stage in their educational development.

DONALD MACLEOD

The Comfortable Pew, by Pierre Berton. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, 1965. Pp. 137. \$1.95 (paper).

Just Think, Mr. Berton, by Ted Byfield. Morehouse-Barlow Co., New York, 1965. Pp. 149. \$2.25 (paper).

Of the writing of books on the diseases of the church there seems to be no end. Temporarily, however, some of these writers are engaged in an internecine strife as they have turned upon themselves. Two recent paperbacks, both by journalists, exemplify the current exposé of the good and bad within ecclesiastical programs and established structures. The first of these set off a flurry of controversy in Canada when the Anglican Church, bewailing the unpopularity and lagging sales of its traditional annual study book, engaged a popular journalist, who had left the church, to evaluate the inside from the outside. The results were phenomenal. Proportionately according to populations, the sales of Pierre Berton's diagnostic paperback in Canada outstripped Bishop Robinson's *Honest to God* in Great Britain. A best seller in Canada is named at 10,000 copies. Berton's book is reaching the 200,000 mark!

Now that the smoke and dust have cleared somewhat, another journalist, Ted Byfield, who is now a Master at St. John's Cathedral Boys' School, Selkirk, Manitoba, has challenged Berton in *Just Think, Mr. Berton* (a little harder). This is a discussion of the church by one who was on the outside but who came inside and found such benefits that he has been persuaded to announce there are flaws in Berton's case.

Berton, a self-declared agnostic, sets down in a racy and biting style his answers to the oft-recurring query, "What's wrong with the church?" He names fourteen reasons why he ditched the church. Some of these are "old hat"; others were true a half-century ago; and some others have been lamented sorely by the church itself. Byfield allows that some of Berton's structures are true and valid, but he refuses to accept him as a competent ecclesiastical critic and he is alarmed especially at "what he [Berton] implies would be right" for the church.

The substance of Berton's polemic includes denunciation of the caste system in the church, a poverty that appears in crises when the church has nothing to say or when what it says is in a dated language already too little and too late, an isolation from a real world except when it wants to be on the side of the biggest battalions, blindness to the possibilities of contemporary mass media, and enslavement to the "Thou shalt not's" of the old morality. To meet the challenge of the New Age, Berton calls on the church to revolutionize itself, which may demand that it even die unto self that it may live again.

Byfield's book has a preface by a clergyman-physicist, Dr. William G. Pollard, who serves as an Anglican priest and scientist at the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies in Tennessee. He commends Berton more than Byfield does, but at the same time accuses him of a lack of a sense of sin and its consequences, of a clear knowledge of history, of a comprehension of the real nature of the church, and of a sober conception of the church's real business. The latter he identifies as being the custodian of a "story" of God's act of love and grace, and not as a society for the propagation of ethical ideals. Then Byfield takes up Berton's challenge and in twelve rather loosely composed chapters describes his own pilgrimage from non-faith to faith, itself a fascinating account. "If you really want to examine the Christian church, you have to live in it" (p. 103). Dogmas are inevitable, he warns, but they do not become millstones if their presuppositions are a sincere "I believe." He concludes his treatise with an appeal for personal religion and more

spiritual resources within the arena of the human heart where the world's moral struggle occurs in microcosmic form.

Both of these writers are right on many accounts and overly general on others. Burton's conception of Christianity is myopic, while Byfield's solutions are too perilously easy. Both books are timely and indeed necessary, but now that the authors and we have gotten all these *pros* and *cons* through and out of our system, we would do well to re-read Paul's writings to the early church and see how the ills of these contemporary decades are not entirely peculiar but actually an amazing reflection.

DONALD MACLEOD

Christian Conscience and Negro Emancipation, by Ralph Moellering. Fortress Press, Phila., 1965. Pp. 214. \$3.75.

"Conscience and emancipation are the two key concepts around which this book revolves," writes Moellering. The author has not defined conscience, but it is evidently to be understood in the broadest sense of the social obligations of the institutional church. Emancipation, also undefined, connotes freedom both from slavery and from bondage to the socio-cultural realities of prejudice and discrimination.

The first three chapters are historical accounts of the major events and socio-economic factors which related the Negro to slavery and slavery to the American social structure. Beyond this accounting of events and influences, Moellering sets forth what he sees as the "striking relationship between pre-Civil War disputation over slavery and the post-World War II controversies over segregation." While Moellering claims that Ernst Troeltsch is not fully correct in asserting that the church sanctioned the perpetuation of slavery, the author's opposition to those who assert that the church took the lead in extirpating the slavery system is diametrical and decisive. Moellering's interpretation of pivotal events leads him, he claims, to a middle position, but this position declares that economic and political factors have been determinative of the lot of the Negro in American life; the church's judg-

ments have been too late, too weak, or mere rationalizations for the *status quo*. In holding this viewpoint, Moellering may not stand in Troeltsch's shoes, but he is well within Troeltsch's shadow.

The following three chapters explore the wide diversity of theological opinion which was developed around the issue of slavery. A key position in defense of slavery was that of Presbyterian professor James Henley Thornwell who presented his case in such a manner that slavery and the Bible seemed to stand or fall together. The upshot of the defense was that the Christian religion should prescribe reciprocal duties between master and slave but not challenge the institution of slavery. As a result, Moellering points out that there was more Christian instruction of the Negro in the South than in the North; the freedmen of the North were not felt to be the special, or even fit, objects for such instruction.

In opposition to slavery, influential positions were taken by Theodore Weld and William Ellery Channing. Weld and others attempted a point-for-point refutation of the biblical defense of slavery. Channing and his followers argued from the humanitarian premises that the chief aim of civil society should be "to secure rights, not accumulate wealth"; therefore, it was deemed "iniquitous to seize a man and hold him as property because he has rights." Interestingly, Moellering notes that among more conservative evangelicals we can see the mid-twentieth century counterpart of Theodore Weld and his colleagues, and among the leading spokesmen for the National Council of Churches and more liberal churchmen, it is possible to trace some of the thinking of William Channing. But in neither of these dimensions of the opposition has the pre-Civil War fervor of the abolitionists caught hold; it is in Negro Christianity under the leadership of Martin Luther King that this fervent demand for immediate action has been re-created.

Theological neutrality was maintained by such persons as Charles Hodge, William Paley, Samuel Seabury and their respective followers, and by the ecclesiastical bodies of the Roman Catholic Church and the divisions of American Lutheranism. The essence of this fence-walking position was that while

slavery was not desirable or necessary, nevertheless, morality could not be legislated. Therefore, if any action at all were advocated, it was to follow a strategy of gradualism.

Delineating the history of the church in relationship to the Negro cause, as Moellering has done, necessitates his coming to the conclusion in the following chapter that the church should repent and ask to be forgiven for its multi-lateral failures.

Chapter VIII introduces in parentheses, as it were, the issue of racial intermarriage. The discussion takes most of its data from contemporary fiction and is lacking in psycho-social perspectives which are so crucial in this particular matter. However, Moellering makes one important, frequently-ignored point: "... what is lowest on the Negro scale of values ("social equality") is what white Americans dread most. Fair employment practices, decent housing, and equal educational opportunities are at the top of the Negro's list of demands, not bed partnerships with white women."

In Chapter IX Moellering, assuming without explication a contextual method for the interpretation and application of Biblical truth, discloses the constructive proposals which he believes will constitute an effective response of the Christian conscience. In brief, the churches should: (1) throughout all their agencies, including schools, charities, homes for the aged, publishing houses and hospitals, take the lead in constructing a better society by eliminating all discriminatory practices; (2) break down the Negro ghetto, both in sociological fact and in idea, and replace special missions for "colored people" with recruitment of Negroes for leadership in the church at large; (3) accelerate communicant integration in local congregations; (4) safeguard the conscience of the community regarding the misuse of stereotypes and false, racially biased explanations of social disorganization such as crime, illegitimacy and illiteracy; (5) refute myths (e.g. miscegenation is a sin punished with congenital disorders) with anthropological and psychological evidence (not with excerpts from novels); (6) voice protest against injustices, remembering that silence implies consent or indifference; (7) support legislation, both local and national, outlaw-

ing the evils of intolerance; (8) help open equal job opportunities in private industry and government; (9) stand behind minorities who are seeking to attain their rights through non-violent resistance and judicial action; (10) disperse and integrate worthy energetic members of Negro ghettos by finding them jobs and housing and by taking leadership in enabling them to become first class citizens in the community; (11) initiate changes in inner-city ministry by beginning where people are, through experiments with non-liturgical worship, "block clubs" and house meetings; and (12) amend their constitutions to include provision for a Board of Social Action. While these notions are already present, at least in idea, in the major denominations, it is clarifying to have an outline for social action summarized in terms of specific proposals.

These twelve facets of a program for social action presented by a Lutheran pastor and published by the Fortress Press constitute an expression of the more liberal Lutheranism which breaks from the virtues of passivity and acquiescence to the *status quo*. However, the basic argument of Moellering's book is of the most general sort: the church's historical stance in regard to race relations has been deplorable and theologically equivocal; therefore, it should now correct its errors and take the leadership for improving society in the matter of integration. This positive suggestion, however laudable, is not supported either by a constructive application of the historical data presented or by any fresh theological insight. In the concluding chapters (IX and X), Moellering becomes hortatory, and what might have been a persuasive argument from history and the development of theological thought is lost in his deliverance of mandates for the church.

The reason for stating this criticism of the book is that there exists in the present racial crisis considerably less confusion about what to do than about the reasons for doing it, and there are often sobering, even self-destructive, consequences in doing the right thing for the wrong reasons. More specifically it is not clear from Moellering's discussion that the historical position of the church vis-à-vis political and economic realities has changed significantly enough to

warrant the assumption that the church can take the lead in directing the course of social change. A realistic evaluation of the place of the church in the social structure is a necessary prerequisite to a drum-beating challenge to the church to lead society in the changing of its basic structures. In its effort to facilitate the reconciliation of man to man, the church must avoid a neurotic "search for glory" however couched in good will it may be.

Theologically, it is not at all evident from Moellering's analysis how "sin" can become a cause for social action. Even if the entire human race were a homogeneous shade of reddish-yellowish-tan, with uniformly wavy hair, "sin" would still persist; the fundamental dichotomy between God and man can never be an object for corrective social action. Rather, an emphasis contrary to Moellering's seems theologically more viable as a basis for social action: beyond conscience, a redeemed freedom for involvement in the historical present makes compassion and corrective social action not only a possibility but also the fulfillment of that freedom. But, on theological grounds, one cannot make social concern into a moral obligation without re-creating in essence a social action version of Pharisaism. The bigotry-bearing dichotomy between "black" and "white" is no more divisive than the dichotomy between the "good" social actionists and the "bad" stay-at-homes. Doing the right thing for the wrong reason not only destroys the effectiveness of the right action but also deludes the agent himself into believing in a virtue which does not exist.

Thus, it is regrettable that Moellering does not develop more fully the continuity between his interpretations of history, dominant theological positions and the rationale behind his own proposals. Nevertheless, he has set the issue of Negro rights in historical and theological perspective, and he has been concrete in his expectations for the future behavior of the church. For these reasons the book will prove to be a helpful study guide and resource for concerned laymen and clergymen.

JAMES E. LODER

Understanding and Helping the Narcotic Addict, by Tommie L. Duncan,

Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1965. Pp. 143. \$2.95; and *Helping Youth in Conflict*, by Francis I. Frelick, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1965. Pp. 144. \$2.95.

Both of these volumes are in the *Successful Pastoral Counseling Series* currently being produced under the general editorship of the late Russell L. Dicks. Like other volumes in that series, they are designed to "be read on the run," so to speak, by busy pastors who wish to be informed about various issues and areas related to pastoral care.

These two volumes succeed better than some others in that series in being sound and informative without over-simplification. They deal with topics which are inter-related, in that Duncan's work on narcotics addiction focuses on one particularly insidious manifestation of the larger problem discussed in Frelick's book. Both throw the spotlight on the social conditions which have become such an urgent concern in our day—the chaos and pathos of the urban racial ghettos.

Both authors present useful descriptions of the climate in which disturbed and "delinquent" young people often live as well as sympathetic discussion, based in part on actual cases, of the victims themselves and various efforts to help them. It is indeed as victims that the authors see these young people whose behavior brings them into conflict with the established pattern of our society. They are viewed as immature, dependent, anxious or infantile individuals who cannot "make it" in our world without a great deal of love and understanding. Both writers see the necessity of their developing capacities for self-discipline and responsibility, however, which means that those who would help them must also know how to set limits.

Frelick, in particular, has helpful suggestions to pastors about how they can assist inadequate and immature young people through various kinds of group approaches. Both rightly view individual pastoral counseling as not being an adequate approach in itself to these persons, though it may be useful as a stepping stone into group life.

Neither has attempted anything resembling

a theological analysis of the problems and solutions discussed, which is in keeping with the general program of this series. The reader, however, may well raise questions for himself regarding social and individual aspects of human strength and weakness, and

ponder the paradox implicit in these works, that the weakness must be understood as sickness, but the healing requires the development of moral and spiritual capacities.

JAMES N. LAPSLY

ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHERS

Akademie-Verlag, Leipziger Str. 3-4, Berlin W. 1
Doubleday & Company, 375 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y.
Fortress Press, 2900 Queen Lane, Philadelphia 29, Pennsylvania
Harper & Row Publishers, 49 East 33rd Street, New York 16, N.Y.
Hodder & Stoughton, 20 Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4
Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.
John Knox Press, Box 1176, Richmond 9, Virginia
J. B. Lippincott Company, East Washington Square, Philadelphia 5, Pennsylvania
McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 West 42nd Street, New York 36, N.Y.
Morehouse-Barlow Company, 14 East 41st Street, New York 17, N.Y.
Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
Charles Scribner's Sons, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.
The Saint Andrew Press, 121 George Street, Edinburgh 2, Scotland

